



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010

No. 62

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 29, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICK LARSEN to act as speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Mighty and wonderful are Your works, Lord God Almighty. Just and true are Your ways, O King of all the nations.

Who would dare not to give You the honor and glory due Your Holy Name, O Lord.

For You alone are holy, all nations shall come and worship in Your presence.

Your mighty deeds are clearly seen both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. KOSMAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. KOSMAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING DR. PAMELA CARBIENER

(Ms. KOSMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KOSMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and privilege to recognize on the floor of the United States House of Representatives Dr. Pamela Carbiener for her extensive community service and spirit of volunteerism.

Dr. Carbiener has dedicated her life's work to helping those in need, with a particular focus on women and children. She is the cofounder and member of the Community Outreach to Prevent Eating Disorders, medical supervisor for the Children's Advocacy Center for Victims of Assault, medical supervisor for the Volusia County Rape Crisis Center, and board and coalition member for Healthy Start of Volusia and Flagler Counties. She also serves as the chair of Daytona State College's Women's Advocacy Board.

Dr. Carbiener practices at Halifax OB/GYN Associates in Daytona Beach, Florida, and she resides in nearby Ormond Beach with her husband, Frank, and their three children, Sarah, Katie, and Charlie.

Dr. Carbiener's contributions to Halifax Health and their board of directors, which is the governing body of the largest health care provider in the area, are numerous, generous, and valuable.

Today I would like to officially thank Dr. Carbiener for her tireless work and dedication to the health, well-being, safety, and care not only of her patients, but also to the countless citizens who are affected by her volunteerism and her work in the community. She is recognized as an accomplished and outstanding community leader for the greater Halifax region. Congratulations, Dr. Carbiener.

ANGEL INVESTORS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, this week I received a letter from a friend who works for a medical device company that is looking to expand its business by attracting an angel investor. Who are angel investors? They are wealthy individuals who invest their own money in companies with promise. They are not speculators. They are not brokers. They are individuals with vision who seek out entrepreneurs with creative ideas.

New regulations proposed in the Senate financial reform bill would require a 120-day waiting period for startups seeking funds and add more restrictions on the minimum assets or income needed to become an angel investor. Angel investing is not what brought down our economy. In fact, startups funded by such investments provided 10 percent of all new jobs even though they account for less than 1 percent of the new companies. Starbucks, Costco, Facebook, Google, the list of successful angel investment companies is long.

In my friend's case, if his company is not able to attract new investment, they will be unable to hire new workers or invest in new equipment. We should not cut short job growth with excessive new regulations.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3017

SUPPORT SMALL MODULAR REACTORS

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced two bills designed to incentivize small modular reactors, one of the most promising areas in the future of nuclear power. One-third the size of today's plants, small reactors are cheaper and take half the time to build. These reactors offer more siting options and provide additional safety benefits.

The Nuclear Power 2021 Act is modeled for small reactors after the successful Nuclear Power 2010 program, and the Nuclear Energy Research Initiative Improvement Act requires the Department of Energy to develop a strategy to lower the cost of constructing and licensing nuclear reactors, including small reactors.

In seeking a bipartisan solution, I introduced these pieces of legislation working in concert with Energy and Commerce Ranking Member JOE BARTON and a bipartisan group of 19 other Members. I look forward to continue working with my colleagues to expediently bring small reactors to the market.

A SOVEREIGN DEBT CRISIS?

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Too often, the Congress focuses on problems of the past, not dangers to come. Last month, the Greek Government lost its AAA credit rating. On May 19, Greece will have to pay \$10 billion in loans that it does not have the money to cover. The market will only lend now at a 24 percent interest rate. Estimates are that an IMF Greek bailout will cost \$100 billion.

On Monday, Portugal lost its AAA rating, and this news triggered a sudden loss in our own stock market. Yesterday, Spain lost its credit rating, and the Spanish problem is five times the size of the Greek problem. Italy and Ireland may be next. We may soon face a sovereign debt crisis.

CRS reports that the IMF has \$268 billion to lend, an amount that could quickly be exceeded by a European debt crisis. The IMF may not have the resources to handle this crisis, and the Fed and the U.S. taxpayer may be called on to bail out these irresponsible governments. Few in Congress even know of this danger to our economy and to our family incomes.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I stand this morning in solidarity with all those

who respect fairness and justice in opposition to the Arizona Senate Bill 1070. This is an unconstitutional law that is inspired by racism and will lead to racial profiling of Hispanics and people of color.

We must do all we can to stop this law. That's why I am calling for an economic boycott of Arizona. I also encourage all those to oppose this kind of hate and to wear the red, blue, and yellow bracelet to express opposition to this bill.

We must all remember that immigration is not a Latino issue, it's an American issue. This misguided law is another reason why America needs comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken system. I call on my Republican colleagues to have courage and to work with us on immigration reform. The American people need this reform, but we cannot do this alone. Again I say to the Republicans, step up to the plate and together let us pass real, comprehensive reform.

ISRAEL RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING 43RD ANNIVERSARY OF REUNIFICATION OF JERUSALEM

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a trusted ally, Israel and the United States have enjoyed a strategic partnership based on shared mutual values and respect. This relationship has continued to strengthen over the last 62 years, and it's critical that America continues to promote this friendship.

Fostering this important relationship means beginning the process of relocating the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem and celebrating reunification. That is why I am introducing legislation today with over 20 cosponsors that commemorates the 43rd anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and supports locating the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem.

In my visits to Israel, I have been impressed by its dynamic multicultural citizens, inspired by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. America must ensure that Jerusalem, led by Mayor Nir Barkat, continues to be a shrine open for all cultures.

Also, congratulations to Patricia Lobb of Aiken as she becomes a U.S. citizen this morning.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

PUERTO RICO HAS SAID "NO"

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Today we are going to have Puerto Rico as the 51st State bill. They're going to say it's a Puerto Rico self-determination bill, but really it's designed to get one thing and one

thing only, and that is to have the people of Puerto Rico accept statehood for themselves.

It seems to me when I checked the history books, in 1967 there was a plebiscite. They said, "No." In 1993 Puerto Rico had a plebiscite. They said, "No." In 1998 they had a plebiscite. They said, "No."

Millions of people are trying to get into this country, trying to get to America. We have 4 million American citizens, and they said, "No." Why don't we respect their wishes? Why do we have to have this artificially crafted bill which has as a predetermined objective statehood for Puerto Rico? It's wrong.

We should not impose statehood or any other alternative on any people, especially when they said, "No, no, no." Just so that we get it clear, it's spelled the same in English as in Spanish, N-o. No, no. So there shouldn't be any problem here in terms of understanding just what the people of Puerto Rico have said.

NATIONAL MEDIA SHOW DOUBLE STANDARD ON TAX PROMISES

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the Presidential campaign, then-Senator Obama made a firm pledge that, "No family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase." The nonpartisan fact-checkers of Politifact say the administration broke that promise, but the national media have collectively yawned in response.

In comparison, when former President George H.W. Bush broke his 1988 "Read my lips, no new taxes" pledge, the national media heavily criticized him. The New York Times described President Bush's pledge as "the seminal six words of his Presidency," and said it helped eliminate "any plausible leadership path." The L.A. Times said it was one of several factors that "ended the GOP stranglehold on tax policy." The national media should hold President Obama to the same standard, not give him a free pass.

WALL STREET REFORM

(Mr. HALL of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Speaker, we must reform Wall Street and end the risky practices that have caused millions of Americans to lose their jobs, their homes, and life savings. The House passed a financial reform bill that will protect consumers and prevent the irresponsible behaviors and practices that caused the financial crisis.

This is the 21st century. It's the government's responsibility to regulate products that are dangerous. To prevent the sale of cars with faulty

brakes, the government regulates the auto industry. To prevent the sale of rancid meat, the FDA regulates meatpackers. To prevent the sale of toys containing lead, we have a Consumer Product Safety Commission. Complex financial products are no different, as this week's hearings have shown, which is why we must have commonsense financial regulations to protect consumers.

H.R. 4173, which we already passed from the House, reforms Wall Street while helping Main Street. I urge the Senate to pass this critical bill.

THE RULE OF LAW

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America is a Nation founded on the rule of law, not the rule of men. That's why we have a Constitution and not a king. Law must apply to everybody and it must apply equally, regardless of race, color, or creed. People don't get to pick and choose which laws are enforced. They don't get to decide which laws they like and which ones they don't. That would cause chaos.

Federal law requires people to sign the guest book when they enter our country, otherwise they are here illegally. There is a lot of fear mongering, political hype, and misinformation about the State of Arizona trying to legally protect itself from illegal entry into its State.

Arizona acts because Washington is blissfully silent and sleeps. Rather than join this rant, the White House should grant the request of border governors and send the National Guard to the border to enforce the rule of law. After all, that is the government's job. And that's just the way it is.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5146. An act to provide that Members of Congress shall not receive a cost of living adjustment in pay during fiscal year 2011.

H.R. 5147. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

□ 1015

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2499, PUERTO RICO DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2009

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1305

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2499) to provide for a federally sanctioned self-determination process for the people of Puerto Rico. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour and 30 minutes, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 30 minutes controlled by Representative Velázquez of New York or her designee. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The Chair may entertain a motion that the Committee rise only if offered by the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee. The Chair may not entertain a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POLIS. For the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1305.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1305 provides for consideration of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour and 30 minutes of general debate, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority members of the Committee on Natural Resources and 30 minutes controlled by Representative VELÁZQUEZ of New York. The rule makes in order those amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules. The amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the Rules Committee report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The rule is a fair rule. There were 35 amendments submitted for this bill, 13 of which were found to be nongermane. Of the remaining amendments, eight are made in order under this rule—three offered by Republicans and five offered by Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act. I'd like to thank Speaker PELOSI, who has been an unrelenting champion of this important issue; and Leader HOYER, whose strong support of this bill helped bring the resolution to the floor. I also want to recognize Resident Commissioner PIERLUISI for sponsoring the bill and Chairman RAHALL for his leadership on this issue.

This bill is based on the most fundamental democratic principle, the rule of self-determination. Puerto Rico has been a U.S. territory for over 100 years; yet during that time, Congress has never bothered to determine whether Puerto Ricans are actually satisfied with the status quo. H.R. 2499 aims to fix that by offering fellow citizens this basic right.

Puerto Ricans have been American citizens since 1917. During that time, they've contributed to our country's culture and economy while also serving proudly in the Armed Forces to defend our Nation. In fact, Puerto Rico has historically ranked alongside the top five States in per capita military service in defense of our Nation.

Yet, in spite of the contributions Puerto Ricans have made to this country, they do not receive all of the benefits that are due to them as American citizens. Their representative in Congress is a resident commissioner, who works tirelessly to advance their interests, yet has limited voting rights, instead of several Congresspeople with full voting rights the Puerto Ricans deserve. While they pay many taxes, Federal programs treat Puerto Rico less

than equally when compared to the 50 States. As I mentioned before, while they have courageously served in the military, and in fact at a higher rate than many other States, they do not yet have the right to vote for President of the United States, the Commander in Chief.

It's imperative that Congress act to right these wrongs which Puerto Ricans have had to live through for so long. The Puerto Rico Democracy Act would do that. If enacted, this bill would authorize a plebiscite process which would offer Puerto Ricans the chance to vote on the future of their island. The plebiscite would ask the unambiguous question: Are you satisfied with the status quo? If a majority of Puerto Ricans vote "yes," then the government of Puerto Rico would be authorized to hold regular plebiscites every 8 years to ensure that voters continue to have the opportunity to express themselves democratically over time.

If a majority vote is against the status quo, if they decide that they are tired of their being treated as second-class citizens, the plebiscite will ask them to choose between nonterritorial status options: independence, statehood, and free association. This plebiscite represents the straightforward expression of self-determination and direct democracy that would allow Puerto Ricans to express their wishes to Congress. I, for one, will support the express wishes of the Puerto Rican people as a Member of Congress representing Colorado.

Like any important piece of legislation, this bill has some critics. You will hear from them today. Opponents have claimed that the bill favors statehood, and they take issue with how the plebiscite is being constructed. It's not only fair but imperative that voters, our fellow Americans, be given the opportunity to express whether or not they approve of their current status quo that is disenfranchising Puerto Ricans.

I urge and encourage my colleagues to support the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to, first of all, thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), for the time; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The underlying legislation, H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009, is a fair and appropriate way for the people of Puerto Rico to express themselves at the ballot box regarding the critical issue of their permanent status. The legislation would allow a plebiscite whereby the people of Puerto Rico will decide whether to maintain their current political status or have a different status. If a majority favors a different status, the Government of Puerto Rico would be authorized to conduct a second plebiscite among three nonterritorial status options recognized under United States and inter-

national law: independence, United States statehood, or sovereignty in association with the United States. They would, obviously, have to be worked out between sovereign Puerto Rico and sovereign United States.

The legislation does not dictate an outcome for the people of Puerto Rico. Congress will not take sides by voting for this legislation. Congress will only be asking the Puerto Rican people to vote on the issue of their permanent status. This process is absolutely respectful of the Puerto Rican people's right to decide their future status.

I wish to commend Resident Commissioner PIERLUISI and my dear friend and former colleague, Governor Luis Fortuno, for extraordinary leadership on this issue. Both of them have earned the admiration of both sides of the aisle in the United States Congress and deserve commendation for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some Members of Congress have concerns that the results of the election would be automatically implemented. I was discussing with my colleague, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, some falsehoods that are being said on radio and other media that the vote today is one that would set up a process that would automatically be implemented. That is not the case. The results of the plebiscites are nonbinding on Congress. So in order for the results to be put into effect, whatever the results of the referendum would be, Congress would need to debate again and, again, pass legislation. In other words, new legislation.

My position with regard to the status of Puerto Rico is that the people of Puerto Rico have the right to decide the political and legal status of their wonderful island through a fair, neutral, as well as federally recognized, plebiscite. I have ultimate admiration for the people of Puerto Rico. They are a wonderful people. If the people of Puerto Rico ultimately vote to request admission to the United States of America as a State of the American Union, there will be no stronger defender of their right to be the 51st American State than me. If they vote to remain in their current status, there will be no stronger defender of their decision than me. And if they vote for independence, there will be no stronger defender of their decision than me. This legislation is a self-determination vehicle, and I support self-determination. I support democracy everywhere. The Puerto Rican people should be able to decide their permanent status themselves.

The House last addressed this issue in 1998. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that I had the honor of chairing that debate in the House when H.R. 856, the United States-Puerto Rico Political Status Act, after much leadership and advocacy by Resident Commissioner Romero-Barcelo, was brought to the floor under a Republican majority.

□ 1030

I was a member of the Rules Committee at that time, and I am proud to say that our majority, the Republican majority, allowed that bill to proceed under an open rule, a rule that allows Members from both parties to have their amendments to the legislation debated on the House floor without having to get approval from the Rules Committee. This is an important issue, and if there's ever been legislation that deserves an open debate process, it's this legislation.

I remind the House of the process that we used when we were the majority because today the current majority has decided to restrict debate on this issue, on this very same issue that we allowed an open debate process on in 1998. And not only on this legislation, but on every piece of legislation brought before this Congress. This majority has not allowed any open rules, any open debate process in over 2½ years. Since they regained the majority, they have allowed only one open rule, apart from appropriations bills. And even on appropriations bills, they have restricted debate.

Now I disagree with some of the amendments that were presented before the Rules Committee yesterday, and if, by chance, the majority would have allowed their consideration by the full Congress, I would have voted against those amendments. I may have even debated against those amendments. But just because I disagree with amendments that were brought before the Rules Committee, asking the Rules Committee to allow consideration by the full House does not mean that I believe that those Members of the House do not deserve the right to be heard. I believe the House should be allowed to work its will.

Now, unlike the current majority, I believe in open debate. Let amendments stand or fall on their merits. Just about every week I have the honor to come to the floor of this House to help manage rules debates on behalf of my party, and pretty much every time I come to the floor, I criticize the current majority for systematically blocking open debate with ruthless efficiency on every bill that we consider. Even on appropriations bills, which have long been brought to the floor under a tradition of open rules, they blocked debate. Today they could have easily upheld the tradition set by the Republican majority to allow an open debate on the extremely important issue of Puerto Rico's political status; yet the current majority, they can't bear to do something so abhorrent to them, to permit an open debate process. They cling, Mr. Speaker, they cling to their *modus operandi*, restricting debate, restricting debate. So they've done so again today.

Now, that doesn't negate the historic nature of what the Congress of the United States is doing today. Today whatever the outcome of this legislation, Congress will send its greeting,

its support and admiration for the wonderful people of "La Isla del Encanto," Puerto Rico.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), and thank you for your eloquent explanation as to why H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act, is a fair bill, a necessary bill, and a bill that is long overdue. I'm also thankful for the kind words given by the gentleman from Florida, Congressman DIAZ-BALART, and for his support for H.R. 2499.

I'm so grateful to you and to the hundreds of my other colleagues on both sides of the aisle who support H.R. 2499. I cannot cast a vote this afternoon, but please know that your vote will give voice to the aspirations of 4 million men, women, and children from Puerto Rico whom I am honored to represent. I'm also grateful for the support of diverse organizations such as LULAC, the Nation's oldest Hispanic civil rights organization, the Young Democrats of America, and the Puerto Rico Republican Party.

I want to say a special thank you to Majority Leader STENY HOYER. The majority leader has been a champion without peer for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico. My constituents and I owe him a debt of gratitude that no words, however sincerely uttered, can ever repay.

Mr. Speaker, this has not been easy, but I am a firm believer that nothing truly worth doing ever is. The fundamental justice of our cause, to enable a fair and meaningful self-determination process for the people of Puerto Rico after more than 110 years of inaction, is beyond question. Patience is a virtue, but my people have been patient enough.

H.R. 2499 is a simple bill designed to address a longstanding problem. Since joining the American family at the close of the 19th century, the Puerto Rican people have enriched the lives of this Nation in many ways. For generations, the island's sons and daughters have fought proudly alongside their fellow citizens of the States to protect freedom and democracy around the world. Many have given their lives in defense these values. Many more have borne the scars of their service to this great country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Puerto Rico has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Notwithstanding their contributions, my people have never expressed their views in a fair process authorized by Congress as to whether Puerto Rico should remain a U.S. territory or seek a nonterritorial status. If the majority of the voters express a desire for a nonterritorial status, the bill would authorize the gov-

ernment of Puerto Rico to conduct a second-stage plebiscite among the three alternatives to territorial status: independence, free association, and statehood. The bill before us would, for the first time, provide the people of Puerto Rico with the opportunity to be heard on the fundamental question of their political destiny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Puerto Rico has again expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Thank you, Congressman POLIS.

This bill does not favor or exclude any valid status options, and claims to the contrary are without merit.

In the 21st century, shouldn't this Congress at least ask the people of Puerto Rico, the 4 million citizens living in Puerto Rico, whether they want to continue to be treated differently, different than their fellow citizens in the States? That is the question posed by H.R. 2499.

I ask for your support.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to yield 3 minutes to my dear friend and colleague from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my dear friend and colleague, Congressman LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of the underlying legislation, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act, and I commend the bill's author—we just heard from him—Resident Commissioner PEDRO PIERLUISI, for his work in bringing this important legislation to the floor this morning. And I would be remiss if I did not also recognize the efforts of our former colleague Luis Fortuno, now the Governor of Puerto Rico, for his many years of leadership on this issue.

This day has been long in the making. With a population of nearly 4 million people, the people of Puerto Rico deserve the opportunity to decide their fate. Puerto Rico has been under the U.S. flag for 111 years, and its residents have been U.S. citizens for more than 90 years.

Since the extension of U.S. citizenship to its residents in 1917, Puerto Rico has maintained one of the highest per capita rates of participation in the U.S. Armed Forces. Puerto Ricans have fought and have died in every armed conflict since the First World War. And yet while Puerto Ricans have fought valiantly for self-determination overseas, they have never been given the opportunity to participate in a federally sanctioned vote to determine Puerto Rico's political status. That is until today.

H.R. 2499 authorizes the government of Puerto Rico to conduct an initial plebiscite. In this process, eligible voters would be asked whether they wish to maintain the current political status or to have a different status. The rationale for this plebiscite is simple:

In accordance with the American principle of government by consent, Congress should seek the meaningful consent of Puerto Rico to the political status that it has had for more than 110 years. The American citizens of Puerto Rico have a right to determine their political future. This bill does not exclude any viable status option, nor does it provide for a change in status to be automatically implemented.

Under the initial plebiscite, eligible voters will be asked if they wish to maintain the current status or to have a different status. If a majority favors the current status, then the government of Puerto Rico would be authorized to ask voters this question again in 8 years. If a majority of voters cast ballots in favor of a different political status, then the government of Puerto Rico would be authorized to hold a second plebiscite on the three status options: independence, statehood, and free association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

After 111 years under the U.S. flag, our founding principles dictate that the people of Puerto Rico be allowed to determine their political future in a fair and orderly vote sponsored by the Federal Government.

And it is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ), the author of two of the amendments that were made in order under this rule.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for allowing me the opportunity.

First of all, I really think that if you're going to talk about democracy, if you're going to talk about freedom, that if you're going to talk about self-determination, then you have to deal with the process, and this process is just patently unfair.

I thank the majority for two amendments. That was nice. But isn't it interesting that as a Democrat—100 percent Democrat, one that has been consistently a senior Democrat—that when I came down here in 1998 when it was Gingrich's bill, when the author was Young, when it was a Republican-sponsored bill and I went before the Rules Committee, I had seven amendments ruled in order. Each amendment was given 30 minutes. That's 210 minutes of debate time. And now when my party, the party that says they are promoting this legislation to foment, to foster, to encourage, and to engage the people of Puerto Rico in a democratic process, the Democratic majority has decided to give me two amendments and then 10 minutes each. Well, you do

the math. That's 10 to 1, 10 times more time, and that's just on mine.

I want everybody to remember—I think it's kind of sad—Dorothy Height. There is a wonderful ceremony. I would have liked to have been at that ceremony. Here is a woman who gave everything for freedom, for civil rights, and this Congress couldn't wait until after the funeral arrangements were completed to begin this debate? You don't want people on this House floor to hear this debate. You don't want a full, compelling, articulate debate on this issue. You want this issue done today. You want it done quickly. You want it done swiftly.

I am telling you, this is going to blow up just like the Goldman Sachs derivatives blowup that don't have any transparency. And then everybody's going to say, What, that happened? We don't know how that happened. We don't know what room that was put together in. We don't know who put it together. But we are going to make a case today, a case today that this bill is just not what it pretends to be.

□ 1045

It is a bill, I mean, listen to yourselves. You say: Well, we have to stop the current system. I agree. I don't like the current colonial system of Puerto Rico either. I think it is a bad system, too. I would like to eliminate it and make sure that it ends in Puerto Rico. But you want to know something, I want to do it with respect to the people of Puerto Rico. I want to make sure that as we engage in this process, it's proper, so I just want to read something to you. Here's what it says. It says that the people of Puerto Rico will be able to vote for statehood. But guess what, we don't define what "statehood" means. I think statehood, they should continue to have their Olympic team because the statehooders say they can continue to have their Olympic team. I think statehood, they should continue to speak Spanish and be the predominant language which it is today. Under statehood, I think that's fine. But we don't get to debate it or discuss it.

I think there are many issues we should look at, but we are not going to define statehood because you know what, the proponents don't want a definition.

Now independent, we don't need to define that either. What is the one alternative that we define, the current status. You know, that's like, can you imagine Barack Obama going to JOHN MCCAIN and saying: Hey, JOHN, by the way, would you set my platform for me so when we run against each other, I have to defend and articulate what you have said my platform is, because that's really what is happening here today.

Moreover, this is what is going to happen today: The people of Puerto Rico are going to be engaged in a process in which, you know, one of the alternatives is going to be sovereignty in

association with the United States. Let me repeat that. Sovereignty in association with the United States. People of America, call in if you know what that means. Call in right now if you've figured it out. I'm sure there are political scientists all over the country. You know what, it's okay if we don't understand it. The Congressional Research Service, that's what they're paid for. They have smart people there. You know what they said: It is ambiguous at best. And this is going to be congressionally sanctioned? And one of the alternatives our Congressional Research Service says they don't even have an explanation for. Let's have an open rule and let's vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Thank you so much.

Look, we had a debate the last time. If statehood wins, I'm going to support it. I'm going to support it, but it has got to win in a fair way. It has got to win in a fair way. And you know what, the people of Puerto Rico, 1967, 1993, 1998, they had a chance. Why is it that we are advancing this? What happened to the people of the District of Columbia who, on numerous occasions, have begged and implored this Congress to take action as America citizens, and we have done nothing. And the people who have said no, we don't think so, we are moving forward.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as today's debate begins on this very important issue, where opposition is obviously on both sides of the aisle, there are two basic points I wish to make: first, to express the fundamental unfairness of this rule for debate, as the previous speaker just pointed out; and second, to explain why the underlying bill violates this Nation's established precedents when it comes to admitting States in the Union.

First, this rule is unfair to both Republicans and Democrats. It is astonishing to me to see how the Democrat leaders are denying the amendments proposed and offered by Members of their caucus. Senior Democrat Members are being limited. Their amendments were blocked. Their ability to speak and engage in debate is being restricted. And for what possible reason, Mr. Speaker? By what justification is this necessary and how is it fair?

In 1998, when the House last debated a similar Puerto Rican bill, there was an open rule, as Mr. GUTIERREZ mentioned. That rule was supported by both the Republican chairman and the ranking Democrat at that time, and it

resulted in a full, all-day debate on this very important issue. So what is wrong with an open rule and a fair debate in 2010? This bill isn't about naming a post office; it is a bill that Congress is asking Puerto Rico if they want to become the 51st State. This is an important issue.

Amendments of importance, of ensuring Second Amendment rights by Puerto Rico if it becomes a State were blocked. Amendments to address the issue of English as an official language, that too was blocked.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be defeated. Actually, the previous question should be defeated. And if the House is going to consider this bill, it should do so under an open process.

Second, the reason why such a thorough debate is necessary is that this bill is a dramatic departure from past procedures by which a State has sought and been admitted into the Union. Look at Alaska, look at Hawaii just in the last century. Look at numerous other States. They all held local referendum on the question of their desire to become a State. When a strong majority expressed their desire to become a State, the results of those individual referendum were communicated to Congress, and it was then that Congress responded to those referendum.

In this bill that process is exactly backwards. This bill is asking if Puerto Rico wants to become a State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. This bill has Congress blessing statehood before Puerto Rico even expresses its will. This bill isn't needed for Puerto Rico to hold a self-determination vote on what they desire of their future political plans. Puerto Rico can conduct a vote right now, just like they have done three times previously.

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to deviate from the precedent of Alaska, Hawaii, and other States where those territories self-initiated a communication to Congress and Congress responded by making them States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this unfair rule for those reasons. I think that Republicans and Democrats on this important issue ought to have as much time as we had in 1998 to debate this issue. With that, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, in brief response to the gentleman from Washington, all States, certainly including the residents of Puerto Rico, if they, in fact, become a State, would have the protections of the Second Amendment, as well as all of the other amendments and protections of our Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

And, of course, it is entirely up to States what they do with regard to recognizing official languages. My own State of Colorado has no official language. I understand there are other

States that do. Certainly any State can establish English, Spanish, French, whatever language they want, as an official language or languages.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

My colleagues, I come to you today in a unique situation because, you see, I was born in the territory of Puerto Rico; and by being a resident of New York and having been raised in New York, I am able to be a Member of Congress. Not a Resident Commissioner, with all due respect to my brother, but a full voting Member of Congress.

And so I come fully understanding how it is to be able to look at yourself and to wonder what, if ever, will be resolved when it comes to the status of Puerto Rico.

This is a very significant moment and a very significant bill. For the first time in 112 years, the Congress of the United States will ask the 4 million American citizens in Puerto Rico what they wish their relationship to the United States to be. And it is done, I believe, in a fair way.

Now many will argue today that it is not binding on the Congress. That is a good thing because Congress can then take the results and analyze them and determine how it wants to apply the results, yes or no, whether it wants a higher vote for independence, if that is what they choose, or a higher vote for statehood. Congress can make that determination.

But I believe the process is fair. It says in the initial vote: Do you wish to remain as you are or do you wish to change your relationship to the U.S.? And then in the second vote if they choose for change, it says: Do you wish to become the 51st State, do you wish to become an independent nation, or do you wish to go and become an associated republic? Well, we have that. Some people say they don't know what that means. We have that. Micronesia is an associated republic of the United States. Palau is an associated republic of the United States. The Marshall Islands is an associated republic of the United States. So we know what that means.

I would argue for those who support commonwealth, that the next natural step of the commonwealth is free association unless they have a notice and it is statehood or unless they have been misled and it is independence. I think the next step is free association.

Why are those the three options available? Because all three options will remove Puerto Rico from the territorial clause of the Constitution of the United States, meaning it will no longer be a territory and then we can decide what to do.

It has been said here that Puerto Ricans have served our Armed Forces.

That means a lot to us. And it means a lot to be able to say to those veterans who are now in Puerto Rico that they will have a chance to express themselves.

Many have asked me, Joe, if it doesn't do all of the things that some people claim it does, why do you support this bill? Because it begins a process, because it allows people to speak, because we would have heard for the first time that we know that they have something that they want to change.

Now, the opponents claim that this bill pushes Puerto Rico to statehood. Now I grew up in New York, but I can tell you one thing as a fact that I know about the Puerto Rican community and Puerto Rico: they know the status issue through and through. I think from the time you are 10 years old, all you debate in Puerto Rico is the status and baseball. And the status is bigger than baseball. So no one in Puerto Rico will be forced to vote for statehood unless they want it. Nobody will be forced to vote for independence unless they want it. No one will be forced to vote for anything unless they want it. They are very adamant. You think I'm excited now, you should see the way they speak about those issues in Puerto Rico. Nobody will force them into anything.

At the same time, the opponents tell you there is no majority support for statehood in Puerto Rico, but they'll be forced to vote for statehood. I don't understand that; if there is no support, then they won't vote for statehood. That's a fact.

Now, briefly, some of the commonwealth people, with all due respect to them, have proposed a new commonwealth, but they have never presented it in legislative form. They've had years. In the 20 years I've been here, they've never presented the commonwealth in a legislative form. We have presented many bills that speak to self-determination.

What they propose, and are you ready for this, Puerto Rico would remain American citizens. Puerto Rico would get more Federal dollars. Puerto Rico would be able to choose and pick any Federal law it wishes to follow and not follow. And Puerto Rico would be able to exchange ambassadors with other countries. That's the commonwealth that has been proposed.

I want that for the Bronx. That's a great deal. And I am sure that the gentleman wants it for Florida. And the Texans would jump at it immediately. But that is not what it is. Give the people of Puerto Rico the opportunity to express themselves.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a rushed process. This should be considered under an open rule, as it has in the past. Even LOUISE SLAUGHTER, the chairwoman of the Rules Committee, was cited in Con-

gress Daily today saying she didn't know why the House is even taking up the bill.

I offered an amendment that said two-thirds of the people of Puerto Rico should vote affirmatively for statehood in order to move forward, yet that was not ruled in order. Believe me, we want to make sure that more than 51 percent of the people want this before we move forward. You don't want to get married to someone who is only 51 percent sure, for goodness sake.

Nobody necessarily even knows what is in this bill; sovereignty and association with the United States has been pointed out. I don't think the people understand what that necessarily means, certainly in this body.

And there is no need for a federally sanctioned vote. In 1967, 1993 and 1998, the people of Puerto Rico voted. They voted against statehood. There is no reason that the heavy hand of the United States Congress needs to come down and force the people of Puerto Rico to vote on this.

□ 1100

They can do it themselves. And if they do it, they should do it with a very simple question: Are you in favor of statehood, yes or no? That simplicity would go a long ways with people like me and a lot of others. Let's have that kind of straight vote.

We love the people of Puerto Rico. They're fellow citizens; they've served in our military. There is a great kinship. But it doesn't necessarily mean that the people of Puerto Rico want statehood. If they're going to have a vote, they should do so in Puerto Rico. They don't need the heavy hand of Congress; let them vote on that straight vote.

I stand in opposition to this rule and in opposition to this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I rise in strong support of the bill. I rise in strong support of the underlying legislation. I am pleased to join my colleague from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) in support of the rule and the bill.

I know that Mr. PIERLUISI, who was elected to represent Puerto Rico in the Congress of the United States as their representative, has worked long and hard on this bill, as have so many of his predecessors. When I came to Congress, Carlos Barcelo was the representative of Puerto Rico, and he was for this. That was 30 years ago, and we're still talking about this. The gentleman from Puerto Rico and Mr. SERRANO make points that I would make.

Now, the gentleman who preceded me said that we are rushing this bill. This bill was reported out of committee last July, 30-8. This bill has 181 cosponsors,

broad bipartisan support in this Congress. And so we have brought this bill to the floor for consideration. It offers amendments to those who are opposed to this bill. It offers amendments, frankly, that I think are extraneous to the basic premise of this bill as well. The fact of the matter is that America prides itself on being the beacon for democracy.

What this bill does is celebrate democracy in Puerto Rico. I am grieved from time to time when I read that some of our fellow American citizens in Puerto Rico talk about the United States treating Puerto Rico as a colony. I don't know about the rest of you, but I'm not interested in having colonies. I don't perceive and have never perceived the United States as an imperial power with colonies. I perceive the United States of America as priding itself on being supportive of self-determination, of being committed to the premise that people freely ought to be able to come together and determine their own status.

That's what this legislation does. I don't think it does more than that or less than that. Unlike previous legislation, it does not say that if in fact the voters of Puerto Rico vote one way or the other, that action will automatically follow by this Congress. This Congress will then have to make a determination as to what relationship we want to have to Puerto Rico in a democratic fashion in this House and in the Senate, as should be the case.

The President of the United States has said he would want to see the status of Puerto Rico resolved. I want to see the status of Puerto Rico resolved. And, yes, if the citizens of Puerto Rico, under this bill, decide that they want to remain a Commonwealth and vote not to change, that will be the conclusion. If on the other hand they decide they want to have change, then they will have the options that the United Nations has set forth for colonies to become free nations.

I myself do not refer to Puerto Rico as a colony; some in Puerto Rico do. The fact of the matter is that it gives three options which are the three options sanctioned by the United Nations, and that is, for a free people to self-determine if they want to be an independent nation, or, alternatively, that they want to be a State, or, alternatively, they want to have a free association with the United States. That latter category, as I suppose similar to the relationship that England has to Australia and Great Britain or that Micronesia has, or some other entity that has its own independent laws, it's a sovereign nation, as is Canada; but the Queen of England is the head of their government. That may be somewhat like a free association. But whatever the people of Puerto Rico decide, it seems to me that I would be, as one Member, prepared to honor.

I am hopeful that today, after 111 years that Mr. SERRANO spoke about and that Mr. PIERLUISI has talked

about, that we do in fact give to the Puerto Rican people the option that they deserve to have and that our principles demand they have.

I hope my colleagues will support this rule. I hope they will support the bill, and I hope they will oppose amendments that will undermine this opportunity that can be a historic opportunity, not just for the people of Puerto Rico, but for the people of the United States of America to live out its pledge to peoples that have an association with us and, indeed, the principle that we ask other nations to honor as well of self-determination.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for yielding.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to my friend from Georgia, Dr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the first step in a process that offers the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico an invitation to become a full member as a State in the greatest Nation in the world. It is neither onerous nor unfair to require that English be the only official language as a precondition for its admission. I introduced an amendment that would accomplish this on two separate occasions. Unfortunately, the Democrats in this body rejected my amendment on both occasions, both in the committee as well as in this rule. Without this commonsense amendment, this legislation is fundamentally flawed.

Throughout our Nation's history, the common thread that has united individuals of diverse backgrounds has been the common use of the English language. It is the glue that holds us together as a Nation. This amendment would help unite the island with the rest of the other 50 States if it is admitted as a State. President Ronald Reagan once said, "By emphasizing the importance of a common language, we safeguard a proud legacy and help to ensure that America's future will be as great as her past."

No territory with an official language other than English has ever been admitted to the Union. In fact, there are a number of former territories that had to comply with English preconditions before they were admitted to the Union, including Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico. All of these States agreed to the condition that their schools shall always be conducted in English, and Puerto Rico should be no exception.

My amendment does not prevent the Puerto Ricans from speaking Spanish in their home, church, business, or on the streets in San Juan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

It simply requires English to be the official language in public schools, local and State courts, State government agencies, and the Puerto Rican legislature. This should not be a huge problem because since 1900 English has been taught from kindergarten to the 12th grade in Puerto Rico. Without this amendment, children in Puerto Rico will never have the opportunity—never have the opportunity—to participate fully and equally with their fellow citizens.

It is my firm belief that insisting on Puerto Rico's adoption of English as its only official language must serve as a minimal requirement for consideration of its inclusion into our sacred Union. Since the Democrat leadership of this body rejected my amendment on two separate occasions, I urge this body to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on H.R. 2499.

Mr. POLIS. In response to the gentleman from Georgia, we live in a Federalist system. States have the ability to determine what languages are recognized in an official capacity. I think it would be misleading to the people of Puerto Rico in the context of a vote to insinuate that there is a Federal tyranny with regard to language.

We live in an affiliation of States, a Federalist system that reserves power for the States. I know that the gentleman from Georgia has generally been a standard bearer of the rights of States and the prerogatives of States and, in fact, the ongoing battle against the overreach of Federal powers, and this is certainly an example of that.

States have the ability to decide what languages to print things in—language or languages—certainly the ability to set the language that their own State legislature meets in. This would be an example of an overreach of the Federal Government were they to dictate that.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I will yield briefly.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

I believe very firmly that the only way that we are going to incorporate people into this country—and we have been a Nation of immigrants, and I believe very fully that we should continue to allow responsible immigration into this Nation—but English has been the common thread that has bound us all together. It should be the official language of America.

We have required Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arizona, and New Mexico to accept English as the official language to be admitted, and I don't think—

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I think it's a very appropriate discussion to have. It's a discussion at the State level; and I know that some States have done precisely that. But, again, this would be an example of an overreach of the Federal Government where they would actually be involved with dictating to States that here you must speak Spanish, here you must speak

French, here you must speak English, although certainly the gentleman has argued there are many at the local and State level that have advocated those policies on behalf of particular States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I would have opposed amendments like Dr. BROUN's on the floor, but I think that everyone should have an opportunity to be heard, even with ideas that I think are premature, because I don't know how the people of Puerto Rico are going to vote. So it's premature to say at this stage, okay, you have to speak this language or the other language because you're going to vote this way or the other way. No. No. All this does is start a process that will allow the people of Puerto Rico to speak. And it's the first time that there has been a federally authorized referendum for the people of Puerto Rico, and I think it's fair.

At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to the underlying bill, but it could have been otherwise, I might add.

The major flaw in H.R. 2499 is that it never allows an up-and-down vote, a yes-or-no vote on statehood or on any of the other status options presented to the people of Puerto Rico. It is a skewed process. It is designed to have a poll that will have a predetermined outcome.

I submitted an amendment to the Rules Committee that would have fixed this fundamental flaw. Unfortunately, the rule now before us does not make my amendment in order. So now, if this bill becomes law, it will not find out whether the people of Puerto Rico support statehood. All the plebiscite will tell us is whether the people of Puerto Rico prefer statehood to independence.

I can save us all a lot of trouble at that point. I concede—and most of my friends will concede, pretty much everyone involved in this issue will concede—that the Puerto Rican people would prefer statehood to independence or free association. So if everyone is willing to concede the only point that will be established in this bill, then why bother passing this bill and having two separate plebiscites just so we can find out what we already know?

We also know that when people have had a chance just to vote on statehood, they voted against it. Well, the answer is that the proponents want to get the results of this system that's been set up this way so they can paint the people's opinion of Puerto Rico in a different way. They want to try to convince Congress and the American people the vote will really mean that the Puerto Rican people want statehood, but they're not being given the chance to vote up and down on statehood. It's only statehood in relationship to the

other options, the other options that are offered on the ballot, I might add.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So, if the people of Puerto Rico really wanted statehood, that could be demonstrated by a "yes" or "no" vote on statehood, for which my amendment would have provided; but the sponsors of this legislation don't want an up-or-down vote on statehood, apparently because they don't think they can get that outcome in a fair vote. So they want to set up the scenario, the only scenario by which they can win—a popularity contest between statehood, independence, and free association.

The people of Puerto Rico have a right to have an up-or-down vote on whether they want statehood right now as compared to their own status. This is a skewed poll, and it is stacking the deck. We should vote against this attempt to misrepresent the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, "Who's on first?" is the natural question that comes to mind on this issue.

As we sat in the Rules Committee last night, we saw LUIS GUTIERREZ, CHARLIE RANGEL, and NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ join up with VIRGINIA FOXX. We have here on the floor concerns raised by DANA ROHRABACHER and DOC HASTINGS, and we have LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART; Mr. PIERLUISI, our former colleague, Governor Fortuno; and a number of members of the Republican leadership joining in support of this.

The bottom line is that we should do exactly what Mr. GUTIERREZ argued both in the Rules Committee and here on the floor last night. Now, I have stood in this well repeatedly, saying that I could have done a better job when I'd had the privilege of serving as chairman of the House Rules Committee. I could have had more open rules. I could have had more free-flowing debate. In fact, as this new majority was attempting to emerge to that majority status, I was criticized, and it was justified in some ways.

We were promised, though, as I and others were being criticized, Mr. Speaker, that we would have an entirely new direction for America and that there would be an open, free-wheeling debate. Well, there is no issue on which it is more apparent that we should be having a free-wheeling debate, an open amendment process, than on this issue before us today.

As we look at where it is we are going, I will say that I was troubled by the arrogance, the arrogance that was

exhibited in the Rules Committee last night. There were attempts made by people like Mr. GUTIERREZ, who submitted 16 amendments, and two of those 16 amendments were made in order. Ms. VELÁZQUEZ submitted six amendments, and three of hers were made in order. There were attempts made to make more amendments in order, and they were denied.

In 1998, as has been pointed out, we had a completely open amendment process. Let me say that, last night, in the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, when we made an attempt to put together a bipartisan amendment, we saw the arrogance of the Rules Committee demonstrated when there was a complete denial of even the chance to recess for 10 minutes so that the Democrats and Republicans could come together and offer a proposal.

I will make a pledge that, if I am fortunate enough to hold the gavel again and if a request is made by the minority to cobble together a bipartisan amendment to deal with an issue that is before us, I will assure the Members I will recess the committee and will allow Members to come together and work on that package.

We are going to have an opportunity in just a few minutes to defeat the previous question. If we do that, Mr. DIAZ-BALART will offer an open rule. Democrats and Republicans alike have been arguing for an open amendment process on this, Mr. Speaker.

So I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can have the free-flowing debate that this institution and the American people deserve.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support the historic underlying legislation being brought to the floor today. Again, I commend Mr. PIERLUISI and Governor Fortuno.

In order to rightly return, however, to the open rule precedent set by the Republicans in 1998, I will be asking for a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can amend this rule and allow the House to consider the Puerto Rico Democracy Act under an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that this bill is revenue neutral for the Federal Government and that all costs of the plebiscite will be paid by the Puerto Rican government.

The United States is committed to democracy, and this bill gives us the opportunity to respect the democratically arrived-upon decision of the people of Puerto Rico. I join the number of

sentiments that have been expressed today, including those from my friend and colleague from Florida, which are that, should Puerto Rico decide to seek independence, as an individual Member of Congress, I will support that. Should they decide to seek status as an associated republic, I will support that, and should they choose to join us as a State, I will support that.

This recent health care debate, I think, helped to show the people of Puerto Rico some of the advantages that might be attained were they a State. Their Resident Commissioner, PEDRO PIERLUISI, did an excellent job in trying to advocate for the interests of Puerto Rico in this health care debate, but he was but one vote. The people of Puerto Rico, counted and apportioned under a census, should have six Members of Congress, probably Members on both sides of the aisle, advocating for their interests alongside Members of Congress, representing other parts of our country. The current territorial status of Puerto Rico would end under any of the three options. No options would be subject to the territorial clause of the U.S. Constitution. As my colleague from New York has mentioned, this is a topic that is discussed constantly around dinner tables in Puerto Rico.

As a Member of Congress from Colorado, I respect the voice of the Puerto Rican people and of the Resident Commissioner, PEDRO PIERLUISI, who has been elected with this as part of his platform.

Given the current hyperpartisan environment under which Congress works, it is very good to see a bill with such strong bipartisan support. It is important to point out that this bill has over 180 cosponsors and that it was voted out of committee with a strong bipartisan majority. In addition, the highest of Puerto Rico's elected officials from both parties, including its Representative to Congress and Governor Luis Fortuño, along with a sizable majority of both chambers of its legislature, also support this bill. The reason is they understand that this bill upholds the most basic democratic tradition on which our country was founded.

Today, we can offer millions of people the right to self-determination. For too long, we have denied our fellow citizens this right, and we are now faced with an opportunity to fix this grievous injustice and to give the people of Puerto Rico the ability to self-determine. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to uphold this country's commitment to democracy and to vote for the underlying rule, which is a fair rule, and the legislation.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1305 OFFERED BY MR.
LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2499) to provide for a federally sanctioned self-determination process for the people of Puerto Rico. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour and 30 minutes, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 30 minutes controlled by Representative Velazquez of New York or her designee. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused,

the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the *Floor Procedures Manual* published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from *Congressional Quarterly's* "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. POLIS. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington) at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1305, by the yeas and nays;

Agreeing to House Resolution 1305, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2499, PUERTO RICO DE- MOCRACY ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1305, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 188, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—218

Ackerman	Crowley	Hirono
Adler (NJ)	Cuellar	Hodes
Altmire	Cummings	Holden
Andrews	Dahlkemper	Holt
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Baca	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Baird	Davis (TN)	Israel
Baldwin	DeFazio	Jackson (IL)
Barrow	Delahunt	Jackson Lee
Bean	DeLauro	(TX)
Becerra	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Berkley	Dicks	Kagen
Berman	Dingell	Kanjorski
Berry	Doggett	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Kennedy
Bishop (NY)	Driehaus	Kildee
Blumenauer	Edwards (MD)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bocciari	Edwards (TX)	Kind
Boswell	Ellsworth	Kissell
Boucher	Engel	Klein (FL)
Boyd	Eshoo	Kosmas
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kucinich
Braley (IA)	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Bright	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Lee (CA)
Butterfield	Foster	Levin
Capps	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Capuano	Fudge	Lipinski
Cardoza	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Loftgren, Zoe
Carney	Grayson	Lowe y
Carson (IN)	Green, Al	Lujan
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	Lynch
Chandler	Grijalva	Maffei
Chu	Hall (NY)	Maloney
Clarke	Halvorson	Markey (CO)
Clay	Hare	Markey (MA)
Cleaver	Harman	Marshall
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Matheson
Cohen	Heinrich	Matsui
Connolly (VA)	Hersteth Sandlin	McCarthy (NY)
Cooper	Higgins	McCollum
Costa	Himes	McDermott
Costello	Hinchey	McGovern
Courtney	Hinojosa	McIntyre

McMahon	Price (NC)	Skelton
McNerney	Quigley	Slaughter
Meek (FL)	Rahall	Smith (WA)
Michaud	Rangel	Snyder
Miller (NC)	Reyes	Space
Miller, George	Richardson	Speier
Moore (KS)	Rodriguez	Spratt
Moran (VA)	Ross	Stark
Murphy (CT)	Rothman (NJ)	Stupak
Murphy (NY)	Ruppersberger	Tanner
Murphy, Patrick	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Nadler (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Napolitano	Salazar	Tierney
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Linda	Titus
Oberstar	T.	Tonko
Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
Oliver	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Ortiz	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Owens	Schauer	Walz
Pallone	Schiff	Wasserman
Pascarell	Schrader	Schultz
Pastor (AZ)	Schwartz	Watson
Payne	Scott (GA)	Watt
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Waxman
Perriello	Serrano	Welch
Peters	Sestak	Woolsey
Peterson	Shea-Porter	Wu
Polis (CO)	Sherman	Yarmuth
Pomeroy	Sires	

NAYS—188

Aderholt	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Akin	Giffords	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Gingrey (GA)	Myrick
Austria	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bachus	Granger	Nye
Bartlett	Graves	Olson
Barton (TX)	Griffith	Paul
Biggett	Guthrie	Paulsen
Bilbray	Gutierrez	Pence
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Pitts
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Heller	Posey
Boehner	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bonner	Herger	Putnam
Bono Mack	Hill	Radanovich
Boozman	Honda	Rehberg
Boren	Hunter	Reichert
Boustany	Inglis	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Ginny	Jones	Rooney
Burgess	Jordan (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Roskam
Buyer	King (NY)	Royce
Calvert	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Camp	Kirk	Scalise
Campbell	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Schmidt
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Schock
Cao	Kratovil	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Lamborn	Sessions
Carter	Lance	Shadegg
Cassidy	Latham	Shimkus
Castle	LaTourette	Shuster
Chaffetz	Latta	Simpson
Childers	Lee (NY)	Smith (NE)
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Coffman (CO)	Linder	Smith (TX)
Cole	LoBiondo	Souder
Conaway	Lucas	Stearns
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Sullivan
Culberson	Lummis	Taylor
Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Dent	E.	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Donnelly (IN)	Marchant	Tiberi
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Towns
Duncan	McCaul	Turner
Ehlers	McClintock	Upton
Ellison	McCotter	Velazquez
Emerson	McHenry	Walden
Flake	McKeon	Weiner
Fleming	McMorris	Westmoreland
Forbes	Rodgers	Whitfield
Fortenberry	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Minnick	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—24

Barrett (SC)	Conyers	DeGette
Buchanan	Davis (AL)	Fallin

Gordon (TN)	Melancon	Shuler
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Sutton
Johnson (GA)	Moore (WI)	Teague
Kilroy	Pingree (ME)	Wamp
Langevin	Platts	Waters
Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (OH)

□ 1247

Messrs. MCCLINTOCK, BONNER, TOWNS, YOUNG of Alaska, HONDA and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. MARKEY of Colorado changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for the vote on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1305 (rollcall vote 231). Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Stated against:

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 231. I was inadvertently detained and missed said vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—222

Ackerman	Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Adler (NJ)	Costa	Heinrich
Andrews	Costello	Higgins
Arcuri	Courtney	Himes
Baca	Crowley	Hinchey
Baird	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Cummings	Hirono
Barrow	Dahlkemper	Hodes
Bean	Davis (CA)	Holden
Becerra	Davis (TN)	Holt
Berkley	DeFazio	Hoyer
Berman	Delahunt	Inslee
Berry	DeLauro	Israel
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Dicks	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	Dingell	(TX)
Bocciari	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Boren	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson, E. B.
Boswell	Doyle	Kagen
Boucher	Driehaus	Kanjorski
Boyd	Edwards (MD)	Kennedy
Brady (PA)	Edwards (TX)	Kildee
Braley (IA)	Ellsworth	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bright	Engel	Kind
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Kissell
Butterfield	Etheridge	Klein (FL)
Cao	Farr	Kosmas
Capps	Fattah	Langevin
Capuano	Filner	Larsen (WA)
Cardoza	Foster	Larson (CT)
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	Lee (CA)
Carney	Fudge	Levin
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lewis (GA)
Castor (FL)	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Chandler	Grayson	Loeb sack
Chu	Green, Al	Loftgren, Zoe
Clarke	Green, Gene	Lowe y
Clay	Grijalva	Lujan
Cleaver	Gutierrez	Lynch
Clyburn	Hall (NY)	Maffei
Cohen	Halvorson	Maloney
Connolly (VA)	Hare	Markey (CO)
Conyers	Harman	Markey (MA)

Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter

Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellison
Emerson
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach

Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Honda
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kaptur
Kilroy
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell

Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Barrett (SC)
Davis (AL)
DeGette
Fallin
Gordon (TN)
Hoekstra

McCaul
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Pingree (ME)

Poe (TX)
Shuler
Stark
Teague
Wamp
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 1301

Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 186, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

AYES—199

Ackerman
Adler (NJ)
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boccheri
Boren
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (IA)
Bright
Brown, Corrine
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Chu
Clarke
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Kaptur
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Deutsch
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle

Driehaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maffei
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)

Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff

Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Speier
Spratt
Stupak
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

NOES—186

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boucher
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Childers
Clay
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Farr
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Griffith
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Honda
Hunter
Inglis
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan (OH)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kline (MN)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary

Minnick
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Olson
Paul
Paulsen
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reichert
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Schock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—45

Barrett (SC)
Bean
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Cleaver
Cohen
Davis (AL)
DeGette
Dingell
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson

Fallin
Gingrey (GA)
Gordon (TN)
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hoekstra
Johnson (GA)
Kagen
Kilpatrick (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon

Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Pascarell
Pingree (ME)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schradner
Schwartz
Shuler
Stark
Tanner

Teague
TsongasWamp
WaxmanWilson (OH)
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1332

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, CLAY, and BUYER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GARAMENDI, DELAHUNT, ROTHMAN of New Jersey, RANGEL, CUELLAR, ENGEL, COSTELLO, ACKERMAN, NYE, FATTAH, STUPAK and Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST TO REDUCE TIME FOR
ELECTRONIC VOTING

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that votes for the remainder of the day be limited to 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain that request without proper consultation.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2499.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PUERTO RICO DEMOCRACY ACT OF
2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2499.

□ 1334

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2499) to provide for a federally sanctioned self-determination process for the people of Puerto Rico, with Mr. SCHIFF in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour and 30 minutes, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 30 minutes controlled by the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) or her designee.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 30 minutes. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have the privilege of representing the great State of West Virginia in this body, a State that was born amidst civil conflict in the middle of a war. It is said that West Virginia is the only State to be formed by seceding from a Confederate State during the Civil War. In fact, the western counties stayed loyal to the Union, while Tidewater seceded from it.

Puerto Rico also joined the American family as a result of war. In 1898, during the Spanish-American War, the island was invaded by the United States and was ceded by Spain to our country under the Treaty of Paris. The island's century-long history within the American family has been significant. Puerto Rico was one of the first areas outside the continental United States where the American flag was raised.

To the United States, it marked a milestone in our own political development. When once our Union of States was comprised of renegade English colonies, we then stepped into a role that we previously had fought against. Given our own experience, would anyone have imagined that our new colony would be disenfranchised and kept unequal in our own political framework? Our commitment to Puerto Rico's advancement under the 1898 Treaty of Paris should be our judge.

If our measure of success is today's Puerto Rico, then I state Puerto Rico has done well by the United States. It is a showcase of democracy in the Caribbean. Having some of the highest voter turnout rates in our Nation, Puerto Rico shames many of our own States with its energy and enthusiasm in electing its leaders. Economically, it is a powerhouse in the Caribbean and considered a home away from home for many mainland Fortune 500 companies.

Equal in importance to Puerto Rico's political and economic prowess is the island's contributions to our own social fabric. Every aspect of American art, music, theater, and sport has been influenced by Puerto Rico's own culture and its people. And beyond such contributions, there remains Puerto Rico's patriotism, beginning in World War I when thousands of Puerto Ricans served in the U.S. military. There is no doubt that many more thousands are currently serving in our Armed Forces, fighting our wars, and dying for our country.

To the families who have lost a husband, a father, a daughter or son in our wars, I take this moment, as we all do, to salute you. We can debate political status, but what is not subject of debate is the patriotism of the people of Puerto Rico.

We are here today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives because, in spite of what we have gained from each other, there has been no ultimate achievement in Puerto Rico's political status, which really is the greatest commitment the U.S. has to all of our territories.

Since the establishment of the current Commonwealth status in 1952, four popular votes have been held on the status of Puerto Rico in three plebiscites and one referendum, but none of them were sanctioned by this body, the Congress of the United States.

Going back just to the 1970s, at least 40 separate measures have been introduced in Congress to resolve or clarify Puerto Rico political status. In addition, Congress has held at least 12 hearings, and four measures have received either House or Senate action.

During the last Congress, the Bush administration issued the President's Task Force Report on Puerto Rico's Status which served as the basis for the legislation before us today; a task force, I would point out, that was initiated by the Clinton administration and concluded by the Bush administration.

Indeed, the entire exercise has been bipartisan. The measure before us today is sponsored by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, PEDRO PIERLUISI, a Democrat. It is strongly supported by a former colleague and current Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Luis Fortuno, a Republican. And it was reported out of our Natural Resources Committee by a vote of 30-8.

With this history before us, I join those who say it is time for Congress to provide the people of Puerto Rico with an unambiguous path toward permanently resolving its political status that is consistent with the U.S. Constitution.

When our Committee on Natural Resources considered similar legislation in the last Congress, we exhaustively examined the question of the constitutionality of the various status options available under the Constitution. And we continued that process during the current Congress. What emerged from that process was a clear consensus that settled on the permanent status options that are reflected in the bill before this body today.

The Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico is to be congratulated for carefully crafting a bill which seeks to authorize a fair, impartial, and democratic process for self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico. The pending measure is straightforward. It authorizes a plebiscite in which the two voting options are presented: number one, present political status; or number two, a different political status. If option two prevails, then a second plebiscite would be conducted in which three options are presented: independence, free association with the United States, or statehood. Puerto Rico would then certify the results to the President and the Congress.

Let me be very clear on this point. Nothing in this legislation prejudices the result of these plebiscites. Nothing in this legislation prejudices the result of these plebiscites. And voting for this legislation does not constitute a vote for the status quo, statehood, independence, or free association.

The bill is about a process, and depending upon what occurs during that process, it will be up to a future Congress to ultimately decide Puerto Rico's status.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin my remarks, I am getting requests for time on the floor from a number of Members, and there simply is not enough time allocated by the rule. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each person that is allocated time get an additional 15 minutes.

The CHAIR. The Chair cannot entertain that request in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill. It strongly deviates from the procedures followed by other States to seek statehood, and it leaves numerous questions about the implications of statehood unanswered in this particular case.

H.R. 2499 is the wrong way to go about achieving statehood and breaks from the precedents set, as I mentioned, of other States and, most recently, those States that we entered into the Union in the last century, Alaska and Hawaii. Both of these States conducted their own vote on the question of statehood. When a strong majority voted in favor of statehood in each of these cases, it was only then that they went to Congress asking them to respond to that vote.

This bill has the process entirely backwards. This bill is a bill asking Puerto Rico if it wants to be a State, not the other way around. This is a dramatic departure from the long-established precedent of how other States sought admission to the Union.

□ 1345

This bill has Congress, as a result, blessing statehood before Puerto Rico even votes to express their will. Rather than receiving the request of statehood from a strong majority of the people of Puerto Rico, expressed through a locally initiated vote, this bill has Congressmen soliciting Puerto Ricans on the question of statehood.

Now, Mr. Chair, let me be very clear. I'm sympathetic to the people of Puerto Rico having the right and ability to vote on their own political future. But this bill is not—I want to repeat—not the only way that this can happen. In fact, this bill is not necessary for Puerto Rico to hold a self-determination vote. Puerto Rico can hold such a vote

right now, today, without any action of Congress. And they have done it three times in the past.

Furthermore, Congress is asking Puerto Rico if it wishes to be a State without a clear understanding of the implications of statehood and the conditions that would be required to join the Union. First, there is the question of what statehood would cost the U.S. taxpayers in increased Federal spending. We really don't know the answer to that, but we do think it is higher. And the reason for that is we asked CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, for information on that. And they have not provided an up-to-date analysis of the cost of statehood. So in an effort to somehow quantify the costs, my committee staff reviewed information by the Congressional Research Service. The spending on just 10 Federal programs, Mr. Chairman, would cost an estimated \$4.5 billion to \$7.7 billion per year. Now, that's only 10 programs. We put all of the other costs together, you can only imagine that it may be higher than that.

So before voting on this bill, I think that Members ought to know if there is a cost and what that cost would be. This information could be calculated, but it is not being done. Without this information, in my view, H.R. 2499 should not be passed.

Second, Mr. Chairman, there's a question of reapportioning House seats. According to CRS, based on a population of approximately 4 million people, if Puerto Rico were to become a State, it would be entitled, rightfully, to two Senate seats and six seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. Without increasing the size—435 Members of the House—States could lose an existing seat or not receive an additional seat after the 2010 Census. Again, this is according to CRS. Those States, by the way, Mr. Chairman, include Arizona, Missouri, New York, South Carolina, Texas, and my home State of Washington. The public deserves to know whether their State would lose representation to provide six of 435 House seats to Puerto Rico, or whether their proposed solution is that the Nation needs more Members of Congress. In other words, increase the number of Members from 435 to 440 or 441.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is the question of whether English should be the official language of Puerto Rico. When a similar bill was debated in the House in 1998, an amendment on the issue of English as the official language was allowed to be offered on the floor of this House and allowed to be debated. Unfortunately, this time the Democrat majority has blocked direct amendments on this issue. Currently, both Spanish and English are the official languages of Puerto Rico. However, as a practical matter, Puerto Rico is predominantly Spanish-speaking. Spanish is used in the state legislature, local courts, businesses, and in schools.

Now, during our history, the matter of the English language was addressed

during the admission of other States into the Union. And those States include Arizona, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. So I think it's only fair and appropriate to address and debate English as the official language in regard to statehood for Puerto Rico.

So, Mr. Chairman, we should not move forward with this bill until there are answers to those three issues, at least, that I have brought up. I think it would be more fair and more responsible to the residents and the 50 States and the people if we had answers to those questions before, and the conditions of statehood, rather than doing it before we have even gotten to that point.

So for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say that the gentleman from West Virginia, my colleague and friend, the chairman of the Natural Resources, is right. This is, Mr. Chairman, about process. It's about the fact that this is a flawed process. Not only was this bill drafted unilaterally, but it was prepared in a biased manner, with a predetermined outcome in mind.

Let us be clear. This legislation is designed to push the statehood agenda, regardless of whether that agenda is the best solution for the island or even among the people. The chairman of the Natural Resources Committee also mentioned that four plebiscites have been held in Puerto Rico. Yes, he is correct. In the past three plebiscites, the men and women of Puerto Rico have consistently voted in favor of Commonwealth status and against statehood.

I tell you that this legislation has no business being on the floor today. It raises a host of questions. It has zero probability of becoming law. However, it does place Members in the awkward position of explaining why they are meddling in Puerto Rico when a request from Puerto Rico has not even been made.

There are economic issues that we must address first. The President has ordered his White House Task Force on Puerto Rico to advise him and Congress on policies and initiatives that promote job creation, education, clean energy, and health care. Instead of dealing first with the very real concerns of how the people of Puerto Rico survive day by day, we are telling them our priority is to debate a status bill that will not become law. This is a disgrace. It is baffling that the statehood question, which lost in 1967, 1993, and again in 1998, is now allowed to scheme its way to victory. It is at the urging of this losing side that House Members have cosponsored a bill that would push for yet another electoral process. Except this time, the proposal that was previously rejected has been put in a privileged position. Those who drafted

this legislation will exclude Commonwealth status in the planned plebiscite by developing a shell game—with a first-round process to legitimize it.

The process that enabled the creation of the Commonwealth was adopted by Congress. The Puerto Rico Constitution was ratified by Congress. This form of government has been upheld by our U.S. courts. That is why it's so appalling, deceitful, and shameful that the people of Puerto Rico will be denied this option. No matter how much statehood supporters complain about Commonwealth, it's the law of the land.

Congress should not be in the business of picking winners and losers for this kind of referendum. It is not our job to create artificial conditions that will enable statehood to win a popular vote in Puerto Rico. Becoming a State of the Union is something that people must embrace knowingly, voluntarily, and openly. If the people of Puerto Rico want to become a State, the statehood option should stand on its own. Why are you so afraid? There should be no need to hide behind process or petty politics.

In a matter so fundamentally important to over 4 million Puerto Ricans, you would think that a public hearing could have been convened to listen to their views. But, no. The Committee on Natural Resources and this Congress know better than the people of Puerto Rico. It is, after all, their future that it is at stake. It is an outrage that a congressional hearing on the status issue has not been held in Puerto Rico since the 1990s. As many know, I have advocated for a constitutional convention to begin the process of determining Puerto Rico's status. Certainly, this is not the only option for going forward. But a sham of a process is definitely not a valid democratic option for choosing Puerto Rico's future.

Mr. Chairman, the concept of self-determination is fundamental to democracy. Sadly, H.R. 2499 turns its back on this very principle. We must not allow politics to undermine our democratic values nor be swayed by arguments that make no sense. If you truly want to honor the contributions of Puerto Ricans and the fabric of the Puerto Rican community, vote "no" on this bill. Stand up for what is truly right. Choose principles over politics. Let Puerto Ricans decide their own destiny without undue—undue—congressional demands. Vote "no" on H.R. 2499.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of claims have been made by previous speakers about why not have a direct vote on statehood, yes or no, like Hawaii and Alaska did. I think it's worth clarifying here that those States were already incorporated territories—and the Representative from Alaska can speak to this better than I can—meaning that it was constitutionally clear that they would eventually become States. Puer-

to Rico is unincorporated, meaning it can become a nation as well as a State.

The plebiscites would determine if Puerto Ricans wanted to pursue nationhood or statehood. A number of Puerto Ricans, as we all know, want statehood; some, independence; some, free association with the U.S., such as the U.S. has with Palau and two other areas. It is unclear what the second largest group of Puerto Ricans, those who vote for the Commonwealth Party, want among the real options of continued territory status, free association, independence, and statehood.

Another claim that my ranking member and good friend Mr. HASTINGS made was that the Congress of the United States would be reduced in seats if Puerto Rico were granted statehood. I'm going to quote directly from a CRS report that was done on this issue when it said that, New States usually resulted in additions to the size of the House of Representatives in the 19th and early 20th century. The exceptions to this general rule occurred when States were formed from other States—Maine, Kentucky, and my home State of West Virginia, as I have referenced already. These State Representatives came from the allocation of Representatives of the States from which the new ones had been formed.

So I don't think the assertion that the number of Members of Congress in its totality would be reduced, with the addition, if that were to be the outcome of Puerto Rico being a State were to occur.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI), the sponsor of this legislation and truly the driving force.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in representation of the people of Puerto Rico. In fact, I am the only elected representative of the people of Puerto Rico in this Congress. In such capacity, I introduced H.R. 2499.

I have heard some complaints about process. Let's address the complaints about process, both the process here in this Congress as well as the process that this bill provides for to happen in Puerto Rico.

The process in this Congress, crystal clear. I introduced the bill along with a record number of original cosponsors. When we compared it with any previous bill relating to the status of Puerto Rico, about a month later the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Natural Resources, held a public hearing in which all political leaders of Puerto Rico were able to attend and testify before this Congress. A month later, the bill was marked up, like it should have been, and it was amended, it was improved upon by the committee of jurisdiction. Briefings have been held. It has been discussed widely in this Congress as well as elsewhere. So the process in this Congress has been a fair process, and it's about time we get a vote on it.

Talking about the bill itself, H.R. 2499 is simple, and it is fair. It identifies the valid political status options for Puerto Rico and authorizes a congressionally sanctioned plebiscite process among those options. It shows the highest respect for the people of Puerto Rico by being candid with them about their real status choices.

I have heard the word "meddling." We're not meddling. We're assuming a responsibility. The relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States is bilateral in nature. For any change in the status of Puerto Rico to happen, two things must happen: the people of Puerto Rico must request it, the 4 million American citizens strong who live in Puerto Rico, and Congress must grant it. Congress is vested.

It's incredible, indeed, that in the 110 years that Puerto Rico has been a territory, Congress has not even asked the 4 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico whether they want to remain under the current relationship, whether they want to continue having Puerto Rico as a territory of the United States. That is a fair question. It is the threshold question.

The bedrock principle of our system is government by consent, and the first plebiscite provided in this bill informs Congress whether a majority consents to an arrangement that denies the 4 million U.S. citizens the right to have a meaningful voice in making the laws that govern their lives. The latest example was health care reform. I worked harder than anybody else in this Congress to get fair treatment for my people in Puerto Rico, and I got the support of my colleagues from New York of Puerto Rican origin, among others. But you know what? It wasn't good enough. We were not treated like our fellow American citizens. The treatment we got fell far short of that.

If a majority of the people of Puerto Rico, though, do wish to continue living under these conditions, we will abide by that, and that's the first consultation that this bill provides for. However, if a majority of the people of Puerto Rico say to this Congress that they do not wish to continue being a territory, then the bill provides the only three nonterritorial options that we can offer or include in this plebiscite in accordance with both U.S. law and international law. Those options are crystal clear. We don't need studies. We don't need to define them further than necessary. Statehood, independence, and free association. And for anybody who is concerned about the concept of free association, we've done it before. Marshall Islands, Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, those are free associated states with a relationship with the U.S. Let's hear from the people of Puerto Rico.

I want to speak plainly now. This bill has been unfairly characterized as a statehood bill. I am a strong proponent of statehood for Puerto Rico; yes, that's so. But this bill is not a statehood bill. That's one of the options.

And it is not binding on this Congress. Once we have the results, we will act accordingly. We will have discretion to deal with these results. Residents of Puerto Rico have contributed so much to this country. Our sons and daughters have served alongside their fellow citizens from the States on countless battlefields in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Puerto Rico has expired.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

As I was saying, during a late night patrol behind enemy lines, soldiers from Puerto Rico, Utah, Georgia watch each others' backs. Any differences in culture or language mean nothing. I went to Afghanistan recently to visit our troops in Afghanistan. I know what we're talking about. What matters is that the flag on their uniform is the same.

As I have said many times before, I support statehood because I believe the people of Puerto Rico have earned that right, should they choose to exercise it, to become full and equal citizens of the United States. But this is not a statehood bill. And that's why, with all due respect to the gentleman from Washington State, we will cross that bridge when we get to it.

The time and the day that Puerto Rico, the majority of the people request for statehood, you will have ample time to debate it, to deal with it, to impose a transitional period, whatever this Congress or a future Congress might want to do.

I was elected to represent all of the people of Puerto Rico, including those whose vision for the island's future differs from my own.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Puerto Rico has again expired.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I yield myself 15 additional seconds.

The intention of H.R. 2499 is to sponsor a fair process of self-determination in Puerto Rico, not to predetermine the outcome of that process. I have to say, in the 21st century, it is about time that this Congress, at the very least, ask the 4 million American citizens if they want to continue having the second-class citizenship they're earning and they're having today.

Vote in support of H.R. 4599.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this is a rehash of 12 years ago. I want to compliment the Delegate from Puerto Rico for representing his people.

The Governor supports this legislation, the Senate supports this legislation, and the House supports this legislation. Strongly, the Puerto Ricans that represent their people support this

legislation. I think it's inappropriate for those that do not represent those people to speak out against this legislation. I think it's wrong not to recognize that this is long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, 112 years ago, 112 years ago Puerto Rico became Puerto Rico. They were supposed to be a State. And I am the only Member of this House that has gone through the statehood battles. This is not a statehood bill. As the Delegate has said, this is an opportunity to make that decision. Puerto Rico is not a territory. They're a Commonwealth. We were a territory. There is a great deal of difference. We did make that decision with the help of Congress, and we became a State. And I am proud of that, and I was proud of this body.

I am a little disappointed in some of the arguments that I hear against this bill: This is a statehood bill. This is a sneak attack. It was brought on us unexpectedly.

This bill has been before this Congress for 18 months, and we have discussed this issue for 12 years and longer. My bill, as I call it, the Young bill, was a statehood bill. That is a bill I would have preferred, but this is not. But this is what the Governor wants, the Delegate wants, the Senate wants, the House wants, and the people of Puerto Rico want. I think that's what we have to consider in this House. We are not the body as a whole. We are the body of the individual that represents the people, and I've argued this for many years because I am one, as the Delegate is.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I yield the gentleman from Alaska 1 additional minute.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. It is time that we act on this legislation. Let it go forward. Let us do what is fair.

And the arguments against this legislation, some of them are very frivolous. The English language. We were not required to have English when we became a State. We had many different languages, and we became a State. We do speak English, and we speak other languages within my State. That doesn't hold us back or make us any less.

But the idea that we have 4 million people that have waited for an opportunity to become a State, an independent nation, or whatever they wish, a free association, it is time we give them that opportunity. To have a body that is supposed to represent all the people but individually represent an area, we should recognize that right, as we did when we became a State.

I am proud that the Congress made us a State. We worked for that, and I think it's time we give an opportunity for the Puerto Ricans to make a decision as to whether they are a State again or whether they're a territory, or whatever they want to be, but to give them the opportunity.

And again, when that bridge comes—and again, I can talk about bridges, la-

dies and gentlemen—when that bridge happens, we will cross it, as far as cost goes. But it's time we recognize the great people, the warriors of Puerto Rico as they serve this country, but yet they cannot vote for their Commander in Chief. It's time we pass this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as an original co-sponsor of H.R. 2499, I am pleased that the House of Representatives is now considering this important legislation. I want to compliment the author of the bill, Resident Commissioner PEDRO PIERLUISI and my good friend the Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Fortuño for their tireless commitment on behalf of democracy in Puerto Rico.

I have been involved in Puerto Rico democracy for most of my Congressional career. In fact, it was my bill, H.R. 856 that was approved by the House of Representatives on March 4, 1998. Prior to passage, I conducted two public hearings in Puerto Rico and literally heard from hundreds of Puerto Ricans who passionately love this country and thirst for the opportunity to determine their own political future.

The Puerto Rican people are warm, hard-working, passionate and patriotic. In fact, only one state has proportionately sent more of their sons and daughters to fight for this nation than Puerto Rico. Yet, for over a century, we continue to deny these brave warriors, who proudly wear the uniform of this nation, the chance to vote for their Commander in Chief. This is fundamentally wrong and must be changed prior to our next Presidential election.

As someone who arrived in Alaska 50 years ago, I can certainly relate to the pleas of those of my good friend former Governor and Resident Commissioner Carlos Romero Barcelo who reminds us that: "We are now being ruled by the President and Congress without the consent of the people of Puerto Rico."

I still vividly remember the words of our Former Territorial Governor and U.S. Senator, Ernest Gruening, who would shout to anyone who cared to listen that: "Let us end American colonialism." While he was talking about Alaska, similar statements have been made by Puerto Rican elected officials for decades.

H.R. 2499 may not be a perfect bill. It is, however, a fair bill which does not exclude or favor any status option.

It is frankly hard to believe that it has been 12 years since the House last voted on a Puerto Rico status bill and 112 years since Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory. It is far past time to allow the 4 million people of Puerto Rico to vote in a federally sanctioned plebiscite and it would be appropriate if this the 111th Congress were to make that vote a reality.

I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 2499. We should no longer deny the people of Puerto Rico their right to determine their own political future.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 24 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Puerto Rico has 14¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington State has 22 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank the chairlady from New York for allowing me this time, and let me share the great respect and admiration that I have for the gentleman from Puerto Rico, a hardworking man. There is no question in my mind that in his heart, he wants what is best for Puerto Rico and what is best for the United States of America. And I can say the same about his predecessor who has now moved on to become the Governor.

The only question that I have—since I have been a friend of Puerto Rico for 39 years, not just legislatively but in my heart, I have felt the unfairness it is to call people citizens and yet to have to acknowledge that when it comes to health care, education, jobs, the only time that you can really know that Puerto Ricans are treated as Americans are treated is when they are drafted or when they volunteer to serve this great country of ours and when it ends up, you will find, that per capita more people from Puerto Rico have died and been wounded defending our flag than from any State or any territory. So it just seems to me that something has to be done. It is so truly unfair to respect our flag and respect our citizens and to tell them that they can fight a war when they can't even vote for the President.

And, quite frankly, as far as the status is concerned, it has hurt me as an American that this has consumed the island. And for the first time in a couple of months, I have heard about free association. I have more Puerto Ricans in my district in New York than probably in San Juan. I have never heard anyone talk about free association. I don't even know whether Members of the Congress know what free association is. As a matter of fact, a couple of people have asked me, since I've been here, who is our Ambassador to Puerto Rico anyway and what is the exchange of currency.

And to see what was happening on the rule, it is clear to me on both sides of the aisle, they want to know, What is this all about? It's about the lives of 4 million people, that's what it's about. We should at least know what we are doing before we superimpose some ideas that we have on other people.

I had an amendment—the Rules Committee rejected it—and all it did was adopt everything except, what do the people have to choose from, statehood? You bet your life. They would be entitled to it. And no matter which way they work out the number of votes—even though Tom Foley once told me when I thought that statehood was really going to pass in Puerto Rico, I said, Mr. Chairman, how are we going to handle this question with the Members? How are we going to handle the question of what parties these people are going to belong to? He said, Forget it, CHARLIE. The only time we're going to have statehood is when there is a

mandate. We're not going to have a divided territory become a State. That was a guy who told me that from his background in history that he was an expert in this type of thing.

So it just seems to me that if we all accept anyone who's known, visited, read about Puerto Rico, that their biggest argument has been, majorly, those who want statehood, those who want a Commonwealth, and a smaller number who would like to have independence, which sounds great politically, but somehow internationally it doesn't make a lot of sense.

So what did my amendment do? It said, Go to the polls. Say if you want Commonwealth. Say if you want statehood. Say if you want independence. Or say, Not at this time. Let me breathe and try to figure this out. Because if we don't know what statehood is, how do we expect them to know?

□ 1415

When I asked these questions, someone said: Oh, no, they would have already rejected Commonwealth.

Well, I think some of us on this floor, if asked if we like the status we have in the Congress, we might say, especially some of my friends on the other side, that they don't like the status. Well, if I was in the minority, I wouldn't like the status either. But the truth of the matter is it doesn't mean that you want to get rid of it all. It may mean I don't like the status as it is. I would like to change it. I would like to have it improved. I would like to improve education and I would like to make certain that the expenses that Mr. HASTINGS talks about in terms of programs that are designed to help American citizens, that they would get them.

What price does it take to give your life for your flag and then find out how much it is going to cost to give them the things that Americans would want. So my problem is that Commonwealth doesn't get a chance. They call the existing government, which I don't really think means rejection of status, because there is a lot of romance and emotion that is involved in Puerto Rico. So give them the opportunity to say Commonwealth, but we don't need free association when hardly anyone here knows, especially the people in Puerto Rico, what does it mean.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), and I understand that he also gets 1 minute from the gentleman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the time.

Isn't it ironic that a bill about self-determination has got to have the heavy hand of the United States Congress dictating to the people of Puerto Rico about this vote. I find that terribly ironic.

There is no need for the United States Congress to pass this bill. No need. Four times, in 1952, in 1967, in 1993 and in 1998, the people of Puerto Rico were able to vote on this. They didn't need the approval of the United States Congress to do it; they don't need it today. But it is a manipulation of the process to try to get a desired outcome.

If you want to vote on statehood, take a straight vote. Do the people of Puerto Rico, yes or no, do the people of Puerto Rico want statehood? Simple, straightforward, to the point, and let's understand if that is truly what they want.

I am a conservative person. I do not believe that I should be trying to manipulate what is happening in Puerto Rico and what they want.

Finally, I will end with this. Please, as you consider this bill, understand that you are empowering people to vote in this election that have no business voting in this election. If you were born in Puerto Rico, you lived there 2 months and then you suddenly moved to the United States and you've lived here for the last 30, 40 years, you get to vote in this election. Why should a resident of Utah or Indiana vote in an election in Puerto Rico? That is fundamentally wrong and it is there because they want to manipulate the end result.

This is about Puerto Rico and the vote should be taken in Puerto Rico by the people of Puerto Rico if the people of Puerto Rico choose to do so, and not because of the heavy hand of the United States Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the chairlady.

Look, this is the Puerto Rico 51st State bill. It is the only result you can possibly expect. The deck is stacked. We all know. I was talking to my friends on the other side, and you know what they keep saying to me: Why are you against statehood? Everywhere I go: Why are you against statehood? They don't say: Why are you against the people of Puerto Rico having a free vote in determining their future and in exercising their right to self-determination?

Why do we come here and try to like hoodwink one another, fool one another. I mean, you know what I would like to see on the House floor, the same depth of honesty, sincerity and clarity and transparency that exists when people come up to me and ask why I am against statehood for Puerto Rico.

That is not why I am up here. I am against a process that does not allow the people of Puerto Rico to exercise their sovereign right to determine their future in a free manner.

Now, what does that mean? Everybody says well, there are 4 million American citizens in Puerto Rico. Have you ever considered one thing, that the

proponents of statehood, the proponents of statehood have never said that the Puerto Rican team must be part of the U.S. Olympic team? Have you ever thought about that contradiction that exists? I am happy to have statehood with a Puerto Rican Olympic team, and would support such a statehood; but does the Congress support such a statehood?

The fact is that the gentleman from Puerto Rico is doing a wonderful job on this bill, knows and understands that the language that is used in Puerto Rico is the Spanish language. It is the language of government. It is the language of commerce. It is the language of industry. It is the language of the courts. It is the common language of the people of Puerto Rico. And you know what, I would love to see the 51st State have Spanish as their primary language.

But do you not think the Congress of the United States should consider such a fact? And the reason I put this to you is because they keep saying, remember those words, "mandated by the Congress." This is plebiscite mandated by the Congress. So what they are going to do is have a plebiscite mandated by the Congress where the statehooders get to define what statehood is during their plebiscite. They are going to have a Congress where independence gets to be defined, and the only one that we define is the relevant current status in Puerto Rico. That is the only one that we define.

I want to take a minute so that we can see how absurd, it says here, and this is the definition, sovereignty in association with the United States, a political relationship between sovereign nations not subject to the territorial clause of the United States Constitution.

You don't think that's going to confuse some people? Just think about it a moment. What does that mean? Okay, so I guess at this point what the Congress of the United States is saying, if this is the winner, this is the winner, Puerto Rico is sovereign. It means Puerto Rico is independent.

Does the FBI got to go? Does the IRS go that day? No, seriously, who controls immigration in and out of Puerto Rico? Who controls the ports? The Federal Government is gone, do we stop sending Social Security checks? Medicare and Medicaid, are they suspended? I mean, think about it one moment. What is it that occurs at that moment?

I would love to see a relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico where Puerto Rico is an independent sovereign nation. That is my belief. But ladies and gentlemen, I will not impose my beliefs on the people of Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico, as the gentleman from Utah referred to earlier, they said, No. They said, No. They said, No. How many times do we have to say "no"? Do not impose a result that the people of Puerto Rico have rejected freely and which they can constitute.

As a matter of fact, the last time there was a plebiscite in Puerto Rico in 1998, do you know which option won? This option beat statehood: none of the above, received over 50 percent of the vote.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In my opening remarks, I stated the reasons why I had a problem with this procedure, and I did not mention the option that you talked about, association.

I just wonder if the gentleman knows or maybe can help me, where did that come from?

Mr. GUTIERREZ. You know, I am kind of like Mr. RANGEL. I mean, this definition is a new definition. Now I will tell you this, the gentleman from Puerto Rico represents the Statehood Party in Puerto Rico. He came down here and he defined his own status or a lack of definition of his status. But you know what the next thing he did was, he defined the opposition status.

You know, that reminds me of kind of like Barack Obama going to JOHN MCCAIN during the election and saying: Tell you what, why don't you tell me what my platform is, write it for me, and that's what I'm going to run on later on.

You cannot allow this to happen because it is not a democratic process. The result is already. Let me just share with the gentleman that Senator WICKER, and I am going to ask that his statement be included in the RECORD at the appropriate moment, just issued a statement straight over from the other body, saying he's going to oppose this measure. It hasn't even been adopted and they are already going to oppose it, so we all know what the end result and futility is of what we do here today. They are already telling us that they are going to oppose this, and there is no companion bill.

Does the gentleman have another question?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If the gentleman would yield, this is a point because my argument was, and I stated three other issues, we ought to know what we are doing because it has been suggested that this is not a statehood bill. But I have responded to at least that remark by saying it may not be a strict statehood bill, but it certainly gives blessing to an outcome on which we don't know what that outcome is. If it becomes association, then what do we do?

I just want to say that I think the gentleman makes a good point because the bottom line in all of this is there are too many unanswered questions on a process where we are blessing an outcome to make a determination whether we should have another, add to our Union the 51st State. I think that is serious, and I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Thank you. This is what I think we genuinely need. But

let me just add further, there has been much said about the importance of American citizenship and there are many Puerto Ricans who cherish their American citizenship and have fought for their American citizenship. But if you have 4 million American citizens and they don't want to incorporate as a State, shouldn't we respect that? Here's the logic, they were American citizens; therefore, they deserve statehood. The finality of it all, the justice of it all, right, the correct course of it all is to grant them statehood.

I think if they wanted independence tomorrow and they are citizens of the United States, and let me just say, it seems to me that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were subjects of the king, and one day they got up and said we want to be free. They didn't quite agree with them, but that also is an option for American citizens.

You know what, maybe these 4 million American citizens don't want to become a State because they love their language; because they love their culture; because they love their idiosyncrasies; because they love applauding for their Olympic team when it goes out there on the international stage; because so many Miss Universes come from Puerto Rico. What if that is what they want, should we not respect that decision?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank you for yielding.

It seems to me that this bill is almost the exact opposite of self-determination. Self-determination would be allowing the people in Puerto Rico to determine whether or not to have a referendum, a plebiscite, and what the questions would be. Hopefully it would be a straightforward question, as they have had three or four times in the past, but to have Congress mandate what the people of Puerto Rico have to do, that they have to have a plebiscite, have to have these questions on the ballot, it seems to me that is the opposite of self-determination and it is as you said, a congressional mandate. Is that how you see it as well?

□ 1430

Mr. GUTIERREZ. You know, I do, I see this as a congressional mandate. And you know what? We should not mandate statehood. Citizens organized of the United States of America, in incorporated or unincorporated territory, under or outside the territorial clause of the Constitution of the United States, should, together, in a vast majority, I believe—because, listen, this is like me going to my wife, and I ask her, Will you marry me? And she kind of hesitates and she says, How about if I'm loyal 50 percent of the time? How about 60 percent of the time? How about if we condition this relationship? Come on. That's what we're talking about here. We had a civil war to decide this. Once a State, always a State. Be careful what you wish for.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009, introduced by my colleague, Congressman PEDRO PIERLUISI.

As the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, Oceans and Wildlife, I fully support this bill which the full Natural Resources Committee reported out favorably on July 22 last year.

H.R. 2499 is an important bill for Puerto Rico and the other U.S. territories. As the delegate from Guam, I understand the desire of residents in the territories to decide their future and make a determination about their political future. Unlike other speakers here this afternoon, we on Guam are also in this same process of trying to determine our status. H.R. 2499 will provide the people of Puerto Rico a congressionally sanctioned process to express their preference regarding their political status.

Each territory, Mr. Chairman, is on a different path towards self-determination, and what is appropriate for Puerto Rico may not be suitable for other territories. But I firmly believe that the process established by H.R. 2499 is the best way, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and I understand the gentleman from Puerto Rico will yield him 1 minute as well.

Mr. PIERLUISI. That is correct.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this is so muddled up I don't know if anybody that's paying attention really understands what's going on.

This is just a process, that's all it is. The people who are going to decide whether or not any territory becomes a State is this body and the Senate. What we are asking for is a recommendation from the people of Puerto Rico. They're dying for this country; more have died percentage-wise in conflicts than any State in the Union. Their Governor wants this plebiscite, their Representative wants this plebiscite, their state senate wants this plebiscite, and the state house of representatives want this plebiscite. They know what this bill is. They've come and they've testified before the Resources Committee. They know, and they represent the people of Puerto Rico.

So these people coming down here from New York and everywhere else, they don't know; they don't know what they're talking about.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend.

The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests

of the House and that any manifestations of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The people who want to have this determination made are the people of Puerto Rico, and their elected representatives altogether say let's have this bill passed. And yet people from New York and from Washington—I mean, I don't know how close the State of Washington is to Puerto Rico, but it's about 4,000 miles, maybe 5,000, and New York is quite a ways away. Why don't we listen to what the elected representatives of Puerto Rico want.

And it's Democrat and Republican. This is not a partisan issue. So my view is, let's let them have the plebiscite. Let's come up with a process that will work. We've tried this before, and it has been split up all over the place. This process will work. It will boil it down to what the people of Puerto Rico really want. I believe they want statehood, and we ought to let them determine that. If their representatives want it, if their Governor wants it, if everybody else wants it, and if they are sacrificing their lives for this country, then by gosh we ought to give them a chance to be a State.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on every side.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Puerto Rico has 12¼ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Washington State has 20 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act, introduced by our colleague, Mr. PIERLUISI.

Many of us on the Natural Resources Committee, including myself, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. YOUNG, have been grappling with this issue of political status for Puerto Rico for decades, and we each have the scars to prove it. We have held numerous hearings over the years in Washington and in Puerto Rico. We have listened to the representatives of not only the political parties, but the citizens of Puerto Rico, and we've heard testimony from across the spectrum, including the representatives of each of the political parties in Puerto Rico. In light of all that experience, I am convinced that Congress must provide the people of Puerto Rico the opportunity to voice their preferences. That is what today's legislation would do, a fair opportunity for a self-determination process.

Puerto Rico has been a territory for 112 years, and it has been an important part of this country in peacetime and

in war. Four million residents of Puerto Rico are American citizens and they are bound by Federal law, and yet Congress has never asked Puerto Ricans to officially express their views on the island's political status.

This legislation does not bind future Congresses. H.R. 2499 doesn't require the Federal Government to create a Puerto Rican state, nor does it force us to work toward Puerto Rican independence. This bill simply asks the citizens of Puerto Rico whether they want to remain a U.S. territory in their current status or whether they would prefer another political status. And if it turns out they favor another political status, another vote would then be authorized to determine which status option they prefer.

Considering the context and the history wrapped up in this issue, this legislation is as fair as you can possibly expect. I would hope that this House would respond by passing this legislation and sending the message to the people of Puerto Rico that Congress would welcome their telling us what they prefer their status to be. That is a choice that they will make in a free and open process, and they can proceed to the second question or not. But we will have asked them, instead of what we've seen in the past is people scrambling, depending upon political advantage in Puerto Rico, one particular time trying to rush to get a vote or get a statement or get a plebiscite. This is a process that's set out, it's fair, and we should support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the proponents have a problem. They want statehood for Puerto Rico, but the people of Puerto Rico keep voting "no." Well, what to do. Well, they replace a straightforward up-or-down vote with a very clever two-step process. If 40 percent support the Commonwealth and only 20 percent favor each of three alternatives, the overwhelming plurality is defeated on the first ballot, and they're left only to choose among three options, none of which they support. And then, just to be sure, proponents stuff the ballot box by letting non-Puerto Ricans vote just as long as they were born there. Well, that means that, as a Californian, I should be entitled to vote in New York's elections because I was born there.

This bill isn't needed for a referendum. Puerto Rico can do that on its own. The purpose of this bill is to imply congressional support of this rigged election process that has no legal effect, that has surrendered any moral validity, and that promises only to set off bitter divisions within the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend from Washington for the time.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act. This bill will provide a congressionally sanctioned process by which U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico can determine their preferences regarding the territory's political status.

This is not a bill to admit Puerto Rico as the 51st State. This bill, instead, would enable Puerto Ricans to determine their status preference by presenting all of the options possible under the law. They would be presented through a series of votes.

In the first plebiscite, voters will decide if they want a continuation of the current status or to change status. If voters decide to change status, a second plebiscite will be held on the three viable options for change: independence, statehood, or free association with the U.S.

The Puerto Rico Democracy Act does not include the misguided "enhanced Commonwealth option." An enhanced Commonwealth, as envisioned by the bill's critics, perpetuates the false hope that Puerto Ricans can have the best of both worlds: they can have U.S. citizenship and national sovereignty; they can receive generous Federal funding and have the power to veto those laws with which it disagrees. If included as a viable option, an enhanced Commonwealth proposal would permanently empower Puerto Rico to nullify Federal laws and court jurisdiction. An enhanced Commonwealth option would also set the stage for Puerto Rico to enter into international organizations and trade agreements, all while being under the military and financial protection of the United States.

It is no surprise that this proposal has been soundly rejected as a viable option by the U.S. Department of Justice, the State Department, the Clinton administration, and the Bush administration. It is time that the people of Puerto Rico are given real options for the future political status of their homeland and not false promises.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill before us today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. First of all, I thank the ranking member of the committee and the gentleman from Washington State for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there are at least three reasons to oppose this bill, any one of which should be persuasive.

First, it rigs a proposed new referendum to force Puerto Ricans to choose what they have voted against four times in the past, statehood. It does not provide Puerto Ricans with a fair, straightforward way to choose among statehood, independence, and remaining a Commonwealth. The bill also allows U.S. citizens who are na-

tives of Puerto Rico to vote in the referendum even if they now live in the United States.

Second, the poverty rate in Puerto Rico is almost 45 percent, twice that of our poorest State, Mississippi. The Congressional Budget Office estimated in 1990 that if Puerto Rico were to become a State, Federal entitlement and welfare costs for Puerto Rico would jump by 143 percent. That was 20 years ago. If Puerto Rico does become a State, the additional cost to American taxpayers of government benefits are likely to be in the tens of billions of dollars, but no cost analyses have been released. One can only guess why.

Third, let's acknowledge that to some this bill is a Democratic power play. The Pew Hispanic Center reported in 2008 that 61 percent of Puerto Rican registered voters were Democrats, 11 percent were Republicans, and 24 percent were independents.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill for any or all of these reasons.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the Republican Conference chairman, Mr. PENCE.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of the Puerto Rico Democracy Act, which simply grants the people of Puerto Rico a say in their future.

First, a little history lesson. The American flag has flown over Puerto Rico for more than a century. It has been a U.S. territory since 1898. The people of Puerto Rico have been citizens of the United States since 1917. Citizens born in Puerto Rico are natural-born U.S. citizens bound by Federal law. They pay Federal payroll taxes, and they are even eligible to be elected President.

American citizens from Puerto Rico have been drafted into military service during World War II and every war ever since—five Medal of Honor winners from Puerto Rico—65,034 Puerto Ricans served in World War II alone.

□ 1445

It has been an enormous contribution to the life of this Nation by these American citizens.

As a conservative who believes in the power of self-determination and of individual liberty, I believe the 4 million American citizens in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico should be able to voice their opinions about Puerto Rico's relationship to the United States, although the ultimate determination of that fate rests with this Congress, and I am pleased to stand in a long line of Republicans who have taken that view. Every Republican President for the last 50 years has been committed to self-determination and democracy for the American citizens in Puerto Rico.

In 1982, President Ronald Reagan said, "Puerto Ricans have borne the responsibilities of U.S. citizenship with honor and courage for more than 64 years. They have fought beside us for decades and have worked beside us for generations." He also added Puerto Rico's "strong tradition of democracy provides leadership and stability" in the Caribbean. I agree.

If the American citizens of Puerto Rico choose independence, I will support that vote. If the American citizens of Puerto Rico choose statehood, I will support that vote. I am equally confident that this Congress will be able to resolve any difficult issues about taxation, obligations of individuals and, most importantly, about the need for English to be the official language prior to any offering of citizenship to that territory.

The American citizens of Puerto Rico have fought, have bled, and have died in our military, on virtually every continent, in order to spread democracy and the right of self-determination. It seems to me it would be the height of hypocrisy for this Congress to deny the very same rights for which Americans have fought all over this world to the American citizens of Puerto Rico.

I know this is a difficult and a contentious debate, and I hold in the highest regard my colleagues who take a different view; but for me, for President Ronald Reagan, and for all freedom-loving Americans, I believe with all of my heart the time has come to adopt the Puerto Rico Democracy Act and to begin the process of allowing the American citizens of Puerto Rico to determine what will be their destiny, and we will determine it as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

First of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington State and the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

I have been to Puerto Rico three times. The people there have treated me in a very kind way, as kind as any place I have ever been, and I think Puerto Rico is a wonderful place.

I served with Governor Fortuño, who is the main proponent of this bill, and Governor Anibal Acevedo Vila before him. I have great respect for and, I hope, friendship with both of those men, but I oppose this bill.

The Washington Times said in an editorial yesterday that this is a bad bill, written "to stack the deck in favor of statehood for Puerto Rico" and that it "actually tramples self-determination in favor of an underhanded political power grab."

Those aren't my words. Those are the words of the Washington Times.

The Times' editorial went on to read, "The bill is deliberately designed to unfairly make it harder for Puerto Rico to keep its current status as a territory with special benefits rather than as a State."

The fairest way to have a vote on this issue would have been to have a simple, straightforward ballot with three choices—statehood, Commonwealth, or independence. However, the proponents of this bill seem to know that the statehood option would not receive over half of the vote in a fair, simple, straightforward ballot. Each time Puerto Rico has voted on this issue, less than half the people have voted for statehood.

When Alaska and Hawaii were admitted to the Union, some 80 or 85 percent of the people in those States voted for and wanted statehood. This is not the case in Puerto Rico.

I have serious reservations about making a territory a State with less than half the people who really want that status. In addition, the last time this issue came up, it was estimated that it would have an immediate impact of several billions of dollars on the Federal budget. With the economy the way it is now, statehood for Puerto Rico would be even more expensive today. As one previous speaker pointed out, Puerto Rico could set up a vote on this any time they want, but the statehood proponents want Congress to rig the election in favor of statehood.

That is not the right way to do this, Mr. Chairman, so I oppose this bill. For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill and to defeat the gimmick process that we are dealing with here today.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

(Mr. SERRANO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman.

So much has been said today about what this bill does. Yet so little is understood, perhaps, about what this bill really does. The bill continues to be a bill I support strongly because, if nothing else, the strength of it is that it begins a process.

When I have told many Members of what the bill doesn't do, they ask me, Then why do you support it?

I support it because it begins a process. I support it because, for the first time in 112 years, the people of Puerto Rico will have an opportunity to express themselves, to say what they wish. Then we don't have to act on it. I suspect that we will, but we won't be imposing anything on anyone.

Another argument is that this bill forces statehood on Puerto Rico, but that argument is made by people who say there is no majority in support of statehood in Puerto Rico. Therefore, people would be voting out of—what?—

ignorance. Well, I'll repeat what I have been saying all week.

I grew up in New York. I don't live in Puerto Rico, but I know one thing for a fact, not an opinion, which is that Puerto Ricans, from the age of about 10 or 12, know the status issue, discuss the status issue, and debate the status issue on a daily basis. It is the number one concern on the island. Therefore, no one will vote for statehood who does not believe in statehood. No one will vote for independence who is forced to vote for independence. No one will vote for free association who is forced to vote. They will do it because they believe in it and because they believe it is the right thing to do.

Some in Congress have asked, Why don't they do it on their own? Because, when they have done it on their own, we have ignored it.

Then there is another reason, one that may offend people if you don't present it properly: Puerto Rico did not invade the United States. The United States invaded Puerto Rico in 1898, and it has held it. According to the Constitution, it is up to the United States Congress to dispose of, if you will, the territory or to adjust the territorial status. If we tell them to do whatever they please, we will ignore what they do. If we tell them to do something, then it will be part of a process—again, that word "process." So it is our responsibility to tell them to hold this vote.

Now, if they hold the vote and determine that they wish to become an independent nation, we will then be able to say, Well, you asked for that with 45 percent of the vote. Can you go back and take another vote and come back with 80 percent? Similarly, if they vote for statehood, we could say, No, you didn't come here, asking us for a certain amount. You have to go back.

So my point is that this bill does not end the process. With all due respect to my colleagues on both sides who oppose the bill, do you honestly believe that Congress would give anybody statehood just based on the first simple vote? I can assure you that, if statehood is ever to come to Puerto Rico, there will be a vote to accept the results of Puerto Rico's vote. There will be a vote to grant statehood to Puerto Rico. Then there will be a vote asking the Puerto Ricans "yes" or "no" if they accept statehood. It is just not going to happen. The process will take years. We are not doing what people think we are doing.

What we are doing is being honest to the comments we make on a daily basis, which are that we go overseas to fight for freedom and independence, for the ability to be free people and to make free choices. Yet we're going to say today that we won't allow 4 million American citizens to simply advise us on this choice? That is a mistake. That truly is un-American. What do we have to fear—that the territory may ask for a change in its status? It might choose not to do so.

One very important point: People say that the Commonwealth is defeated. No. In the first vote, you can choose to remain a Commonwealth. In the second vote, you stop being a colony.

Vote for this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act, I stand here proudly in support of this bill. I am somewhat surprised by some of the criticism registered here. I understand how we can have differences of opinion, but to suggest that somehow this undermines the authority of the Congress of the United States or that it is somehow contrary to the Constitution is just beyond the pale as far as I can see.

As the gentleman who just spoke before me said, this is an attempt to get an idea of how the people of Puerto Rico feel about this very important issue. They are American citizens. People have raised all sorts of scenarios about what may or may not happen. Go back and look at how other States have been admitted to the Union. Ultimately, the decision is made by this Congress.

I remember reading about Utah. When they were a territory, Utah wasn't accepted in the Union until they changed a certain policy on marriage. It was an extraordinary change that was required, but that was what happened. Congress didn't supinely stand here or lay down there and say, Oh, yes. You've said you want to be a State. Therefore, we take no action.

This is a way of our getting a measure of the sentiment of the people of Puerto Rico. I don't see why we should be upset about that. I know there are some outside observers who have suggested that somehow this undermines the Constitution and that somehow there is the Tennessee's plot. Examine the history of Tennessee. Examine the history of the response of Congress. It is absolutely historically factual that Congress decides under what terms a new State will be formed, when and if we will accept a new State.

So all I am saying is allow this to go forward. Allow us to find out what the sentiment is here. Our good friend Luis Fortuno is not someone who shows little respect for the Constitution.

Pass this bill.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to ask the gentleman from California a question: So, basically, in listening to your argument, you are clearly stating that this is a pro-statehood bill, aren't you?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentlewoman would yield, No.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how much time remains.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Puerto Rico has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington State has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. SABLÁN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2499.

As the newest member of the American family just 35 years ago, on a plebiscite called an act of free political self-determination, we went to the ballot and had one choice only—Commonwealth.

For us to say that Congress can give Puerto Rico the options it has in H.R. 2499, because it appears as if it's only statehood, we do this all the time, Mr. Chairman. We're not doing it now. We go to war. We are trying to give people free will and freedom. Yet we tell them it is freedom in association with the United States. It took Puerto Rico 100 years of being part of the United States. Only in the past 12 years has this discussion started.

□ 1500

It's about time. Let's put the question to the people of Puerto Rico. Give them an option. They could choose statehood; they could choose to remain a Commonwealth. Let's pass H.R. 2499. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding and for leading on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just add to this discussion and deliberation that what really happens here is that if this should pass today, and I rise in opposition to H.R. 2499, Mr. Chairman, but it sets up a momentum, it sets up a level of expectations, and the sequence of events being the question that would go before Puerto Ricans and those who were born in Puerto Rico that would live in any of the other 50 States presumably, do you want to stay the same or do you want to change? And once that decision is made, then there is no going back.

The momentum then washes over the dam. And the next question that comes back is, now you can't be what you were before. Now you have to decide between being an independent country or a free association, whatever that might be, or statehood. And when we get to this question of statehood and I look at the standards that have been there in the past, I disagree with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG). I can go up there and English is the language that is used in government and business and everywhere you go.

Yes, every language you can imagine is spoken of in every State, but the practice in Puerto Rico is Spanish, not

English. Eighty-five percent of Puerto Ricans will self-profess that they are not proficient in English. They have very little understanding of English.

In fact, I will introduce into the RECORD the Latin American Herald Tribune, dated April 26, where the Secretary of Education in Puerto Rico, the Governor's Secretary, said, English is taught in Puerto Rico as if it were a foreign language and 85 percent aren't proficient in it.

I will also introduce into the RECORD a letter from U.S. English, Incorporated. Among it is a statement I think that's very important to consider here in this body, which says: "No State has ever been allowed to come into the Union when its core organs of government operate in a foreign language, and Puerto Rico must not be an exception." And, Mr. Chairman, it points out that Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma had those conditions as conditions coming into statehood.

I just would make this point, that I wouldn't rise here today and take this position here today, since 1917 or even the last 50 years. If the practice of education and government in Puerto Rico had been the unifying common language, we would be unified as a people. Let's start that path and have this discussion in a generation.

Congressman DOC HASTINGS,
Ranking Member, House Natural Resources Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HASTINGS: On behalf of 1.8 million members of U.S. English, we oppose the current version of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act. H.R. 2499 fails to address the serious language questions pertaining to Puerto Rico's status, and compounds this error by pretending to address these issues. This vote will be featured prominently in the legislative scorecard we distribute to our members.

As you are aware, Puerto Rico's current policies with respect to language have never been allowed for any incoming state.

While English is mandatory in Puerto Rico's public schools, it is taught as a foreign language, and instruction rarely exceeds one hour per day. Unsurprisingly, just 20 percent of Puerto Rico's residents speak English fluently. California has the lowest proficiency rate among the 50 states, and its rate is 80 percent.

Puerto Rico's local courts and legislature operate entirely in Spanish, with English translations available only upon request.

No state has ever been allowed to come into the Union when its core organs of government operate in a foreign language, and Puerto Rico must not be an exception.

Yesterday, the Rules committee defeated amendments offered by Rep. Paul Broun that would have brought Puerto Rico's policies in line with the other 50 states as a condition for statehood. Instead, the committee reported an "alternative" English amendment by Rep. Dan Burton.

The Burton amendment, while purportedly offering a Puerto Rican state equal treatment, actually offers special treatment by allowing statehood with these historically unprecedented policies intact. Burton's insistence that Puerto Rico will be subject to federal official language policies is meaningless, since the United States has no official language. Further, Burton's "sense of Congress that English be promoted" has no legal force.

The Burton language is contrary to Congress' uniform historical practice when the language of government of a potential state was in genuine doubt. Congress required—not "promoted"—English to be the language of instruction for public schools in Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as a condition for statehood.

I urge any member who cares about English's role in our national unity to oppose this version of the legislation.

Sincerely,

MAURO E. MUJICA,
Chairman of the Board, U.S. English, Inc.

[From the Latin American Herald Tribune,
Apr. 26, 2010]

PUERTO RICAN GOVERNMENT WANTS BILINGUAL NATION

SAN JUAN.—The Puerto Rican government wants to establish programs for teaching English to make the younger generations bilingual on an island where 85 percent of the population admits to having only a very basic idea of the language.

Education Secretary Odette Piñero said Tuesday in an interview with Efe that the department supports the initiative of Puerto Rico's resident commissioner in Washington, Pedro Pierluisi, to ask for more federal funding for teaching English in the public schools of this U.S. commonwealth.

"Spanish and English are the official languages of Puerto Rico, that is established," Piñero said, adding that the point of the proposal is to give public school students on the island the same opportunities as those who go to private schools.

Piñero also said that the measure will make sure that when young people on the island finish their studies they will be able to perform correctly both in Spanish and in English, which she said was something Puerto Rican society was asking for.

She was referring to an initiative announced by Pierluisi to ask that Title III funds be quadrupled for Puerto Rico, which would bring to \$14 million per year the amount the Caribbean island would get for that purpose.

Piñero said that preceding administrations lost their chance to access those funds by not presenting the corresponding application the right way.

The secretary said that the measure "will improve employment opportunities" for the Caribbean island's young people, after commenting that "English is taught in Puerto Rico as if it were a foreign language."

"The idea is to give the necessary resources to kids in public schools so they have the same opportunities," she said.

For her part, the director of the Linguistics Program at the University of Puerto Rico, Yolanda Rivera, told Efe she is in favor of free choice in learning languages.

Rivera said, nonetheless, that "English is a foreign language in Puerto Rico," and there are political criteria for making that language more prevalent here as sought by the administration of Gov. Luis Fortuño, whose party favors U.S. statehood for the island.

"Deciding which language to teach is based on political criteria," Rivera said, adding that if commercial interests were the most important thing, Chinese would be the ideal language given the heights the Asian nation has reached internationally in that area.

The professor also said that she is concerned about Pierluisi's announcement of the hypothetical arrival of U.S. English teachers on the island.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for 93 years individuals born in Puerto Rico have been U.S. citizens, but Puerto Rico itself has been a Commonwealth. And as neither State nor an independent political entity, it has, as Ronald Reagan once said, an unnatural status. It is part of our country, but not entirely. Separate from our country, but not really.

Ronald Reagan was motivated to support possible statehood for Puerto Rico in part because our communist enemies were at the time exploiting Puerto Rico's status to sow unrest in Latin America by calling for an end to "Yankee imperialism." While the Soviet Union may no longer be with us, Hugo Chavez is attempting to sow the same unrest, calling for an end to U.S. imperialism in Puerto Rico.

Reagan said back in 1980 that we must be ready to demonstrate that "the American idea can work in Puerto Rico." Over the past 2 years, my friend, Governor Luis Fortuno, has worked to do just that. The Governor and others are actively working to increase economic opportunity by reducing the burden the government places on the people, introducing competition and choice to education, lowering taxes, restoring law and order, and defending traditional values.

Listening to these achievements, I am reminded that the great experiment begun by our Founding Fathers is not in its last days, but instead is being constantly renewed as we work to expand what it means to live in a land of opportunity.

Our best export has always been our ideas. And first and foremost amongst those ideas is the promise that limited government based on the consent of the governed that respects the inalienable rights granted by God is the best hope for mankind on Earth. These ideas have also served as a magnet drawing all those who wish for a better life to our shores.

The citizens of Puerto Rico share in this American inheritance. They share in our values and in their belief in the American Dream. The citizens of Puerto Rico deserve the opportunity to speak to their aspirations for the future in a sanctioned plebiscite.

If I were drafting this bill, Mr. Chairman, I would draft it differently. And while this legislation is far from perfect, I am motivated at the end of the day to support it by the belief that America's promise is not finite in terms of space or time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Look, let's take another look at it. Mr. LUNGREN came before us, and on numerous occasions, what did he say? Allow Puerto Rico to become a State. Just check his words. Before that it was Mr. BURTON from Indiana. In other words, they equate American citizen-

ship with a fundamental, inalienable right to statehood.

There's no one right, inalienable right, that the people of Puerto Rico have. It's to their independence. And the Founding Fathers that we like to talk so much about would agree with us here today. If Thomas Jefferson were here today, he would say one thing: There is one and only one inalienable right of the people of Puerto Rico, something that could never be taken away from them, and that's to their independence.

And why do I bring this issue up today? I bring the issue up today so that we can understand that Puerto Rico is not just 4 million American citizens on an island; it is a culturally, it is a psychologically, constituted geographically, linguistically constituted nation of people, Puerto Ricans. Go to that nation of people today, and while they may love and cherish America, which is actually a good thing if you think about it today, a nation of people who love and cherish America, they still are fundamentally Puerto Rican. Ask them.

Has anybody been to a Puerto Rican parade in New York? Go out there with American flags on the day of a Puerto Rican parade. See how much money you make at the Puerto Rican day parade in New York or Chicago. No, it's an affirmation of who we are. Very different than the Italian day parade, than the Irish parade, than the Polish parade, in which you see many American flags.

Why is it that we continue to affirm this? Why is it that even those proponents of statehood for Puerto Rico have not been able to banish the Olympic team? They dare not. Why is it they have not been able to banish the language of Spanish? They dare not. Because those are things that are intrinsic to the people of Puerto Rico.

Look, let's stop kidding ourselves. Let's stop kidding ourselves. This is an attempt to do one thing and one thing only. Everybody talks about the American citizens and their right to statehood. What about the American citizens, and I say the only inalienable right that they have, to their independence? What about the 1.8 million pages that were sent to Congressman SERRANO on the backs of the FBI and intelligence agency for those of us that fought for Puerto Rican independence? What about those that have been jailed? What about those poets? What about those great Puerto Rican patriots who believe and will continue to believe in independence for Puerto Rico? That is a reality that we need to deal with.

So when Mr. CANTOR was speaking about the inalienable right, he was speaking about the inalienable right that the Founding Fathers bestowed upon those to be free from colonialism.

The current situation in Puerto Rico is deplorable. The current status of Puerto Rico is a colonial status. And we should move forward to eliminate

that stain in our relationship with the people of Puerto Rico. But they have just as much right to independence, they have just as much right to independence as they do to statehood. And as a matter of fact, they have asserted that right.

Let me end with this: We keep saying let them, congressionally sanction. Ladies and gentlemen, they have come together on numerous occasions, and on each and every occasion, they have said, We don't want to be a State. They would like something different. Why are we imposing?

And really, look, everybody talks about the Founding Fathers. You know how the Founding Fathers did it? They had a Constitutional Convention. They got together and they had delegates from different States come together so they could have a Declaration of Independence, so they could build a Constitution. You know what? Let not the Congress of the United States say that this is democracy. Do you know what true democracy is? This Congress saying to the people of Puerto Rico get together in a constitutional convention, assemble yourselves, decide among yourselves, and we the Congress of the United States will respect that decision. We will not impose a process. We will not impose definitions upon you.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this important matter. This legislation is about what is right and what is fair.

Since 1898 residents of Puerto Rico have been deprived of full and equal political representation. Though its residents are American citizens, the island is not a State and its residents have no equal voting representation in Congress. Given a choice, Puerto Ricans might opt to change this situation. Some in Puerto Rico might opt for a statehood for the island, some might opt for independence, and some might opt for sovereign association. But Puerto Ricans have never been invited by Congress to make that choice. They are American citizens, but they are deprived of equal voting rights.

If Puerto Rico were a State, it would have six or seven representatives in Congress instead of one who cannot vote on the floor of the House. If Puerto Rico were a State, it would have two Senators instead of none. If Puerto Rico were a State, the people there would help to choose our President. Puerto Rico is, in fact, one of the largest populations in the entire world that has no say in choosing the leadership of its country, a democratic country. Now they cannot do anything like that. A host of policy decisions are made in Puerto Rico's name by us, by Congress and by the President, on behalf of Puerto Rico's people without their full or equal input or consent, and that is deeply, deeply unfair.

Whether Puerto Ricans decide in favor of statehood or not, there is an existing inequality that needs to be addressed. The people of Puerto Rico could have more representatives in Congress than they have today with or without statehood.

While I do not represent Puerto Rico, there is a very large Puerto Rican population in central Florida. But I am also here because people on the island of Puerto Rico have the right to full and equal representation. Under this legislation, voters will be asked by Congress whether they wish to maintain Puerto Rico's present form. If the majority of voters cast their ballots in favor of a different political status, the Government of Puerto Rico will be authorized to conduct a second vote among three options: independence, statehood, or sovereignty in association with the United States.

Residents of Puerto Rico have laid down their lives in defense of American democratic values for more than nine decades. In that time, they have never been given a chance to express their views about their political relationship with the United States by means of a fair, neutral, and democratic process. This must change. Therefore, I support this act.

□ 1515

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, having been elected in 2004 to come to Congress, I got here and met someone else who was elected to come to Congress at the same time named Luis Fortuno. The Fortunos were a couple of the most wonderful, lovely people I have ever met, and it's a real privilege to have gotten to know them. So my initial feeling is that I would want to support whatever they supported, especially to have a Republican governor in Puerto Rico. The things that he is doing are wonderful. Cutting government, working to reduce spending in Puerto Rico, those are the things that we need leaders to help with in Washington.

But we are a people who came into being through a belief in self-determination. And so on initially hearing that Puerto Rico would have a vote that would allow them to decide whether they wanted to be part of the United States as a State, my initial impression was this would be a good thing. But on seeing that it has been divided into two votes and finding that there are three choices in the second vote, I am very concerned.

If Puerto Rico wants to be a State, then they should decide to do so unequivocally and tell this body to do so unequivocally. It ought to be one question, "Do you want to be a State?" "Yes" or "no." And if the answer is loud and clear we do, then that's what we should take up. So regretfully, I will be voting "no" on this because I

am concerned this is not the way to decide a statehood's future. I will be voting "no."

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, there is a reason why two of the three main political parties in Puerto Rico are opposed to this bill. They have been shut out of the legislative process. That is the reason. Here we are facing one of the largest deficits in the history of this country because we have been paying for two wars where we are committed to promote democracy, and yet in our own backyard we are denying 8 million Puerto Rican Americans the right to self-determination.

As I stated before and I state it again, this is shameful and it is a disgrace. So let me just say that this bill is not ready for prime time. Let's treat Puerto Ricans with the same respect as we did to Alaskans, Hawaii, and other States. They decided by themselves what was better for them. This bill doesn't do that. For all these reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as we conclude general debate, I want to make one point very, very clear. And that point is that we in Congress on a bipartisan basis welcomed the citizens of Puerto Rico to communicate to us their wishes. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not the right process for that.

I recognize this is not a vote on statehood. I never alluded to that. But, Mr. Chairman, we are setting, I think, a precedent where we are asking a territory of the United States if they want statehood. Looking back in the history, I found it pretty murky whether that even happened. What happened generally, and certainly in a vast majority of the 50 States that make up this great Union, is that they had a plebiscite and they decided they wanted to join this country, and then they asked the Congress to respond. We are doing this backwards.

There have been three votes in the history of this last century of Puerto Ricans, and in every case, in every case they did not choose statehood. So I don't know why we should be part of a process that from my point of view tilts the playing field in favor of statehood when in the past that hasn't been the case. The citizens of Puerto Rico right now, as I made in my opening remarks, can have a plebiscite. They can decide. They can decide by a statewide vote, they can have a constitutional convention, as my good friend from Illinois pointed out. There are a variety of ways for them to do that. We should allow them to do that.

Now, it's difficult. It's a difficult process. We all know that. Self-government is hard. But for goodness sakes, we shouldn't be party to what I believe is a process that is cinched in one way.

So for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote "no" on this legislation, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield the balance of my time to the people's representative from Puerto Rico, Mr. PEDRO PIERLUISI.

Mr. PIERLUISI. It is time. It is time for this Congress to hear from the people of Puerto Rico. A lot has been said about this process of self-determination. And what is self-determination? It is to allow the people of Puerto Rico to express their wishes on their political destiny. H.R. 2499 does exactly that. The only possible options that the people of Puerto Rico have concerning the subject matter are the following: remaining as a territory, which is called a Commonwealth, but the label does not change the status. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a Commonwealth, yet it is a State. Puerto Rico is a territory. And there is a clause in the United States Constitution that provides and has so been interpreted by the Supreme Court, the United States Supreme Court, that this Congress has plenary powers over the territories, including Puerto Rico. And we do not fail to exercise them on a daily basis, for better or worse, to the people of Puerto Rico, who do not have voting representation in this Congress, who do not vote for the President, and who do not participate in Federal programs on an equal basis with their fellow citizens in the States. That is one of the choices. And this bill, this plebiscite, the plebiscite in H.R. 2499, provides for that. If the people want to remain under the current status, they can, like they should be.

Now if the people of Puerto Rico say we no longer want to be a territory of the United States, we should know that, all Members of Congress. This bill then asks them their choice among the only three options that are accepted under U.S. and international law: statehood, independence, and there has been some talk about free association.

Let me tell you something. I agree with Congressman SERRANO. Libre asociación is that term in Spanish. In Puerto Rico everybody knows what libre asociación is. In fact, there is a faction within one of our main parties that advocates for that. And what is that? Simple; what Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, Palau already have—an association between Puerto Rico and the U.S. as sovereign nations that is not a territory of the United States. That option is included. So all the options are there. It is only fair to ask the people of Puerto Rico to express themselves in a way that is not binding on this Congress.

We will always have, the Congress will always have the last word on this topic, as it should be. So that's why I have put forth this bill before this Congress on behalf of the people of Puerto Rico as the only elected Representative

of the people of Puerto Rico, and I ask for your support. Vote for H.R. 2499.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act.

Puerto Rico is home to nearly 4 million Americans.

It has been a U.S. territory for 112 years and its residents have been U.S. citizens since 1917.

Puerto Ricans have contributed much to the basic fabric of this country in times of peace and war.

Its residents have served as high government officials and leaders from all walks of life.

More than one million Puerto Ricans live in my home state of New York, and according to the latest numbers, more than 60,000 live in my congressional district.

I am, therefore, proud to call myself a cosponsor of the bipartisan Puerto Rico Democracy Act.

I know that the question of the status of Puerto Rico has been difficult for many years, but that is precisely why we must address it today.

Under the current status, residents of Puerto Rico are bound by federal law, but cannot vote for president and do not have voting representation in Congress.

Since joining the American family over a century ago, the Island's residents have never been given the opportunity to express their views—in the context of a fair and orderly vote sponsored by Congress—as to whether Puerto Rico should remain a U.S. territory or should seek a non-territorial status.

H.R. 2499 allows the government of Puerto Rico to conduct plebiscites to ask voters if they wish to maintain the current status or have a different status.

I support this bill because it finally creates a fair process to allow the people of Puerto Rico to decide their own future for themselves.

Self-determination is a basic principle of the United States, and Puerto Ricans deserve no less.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the sponsor of this bill, Mr. PIERLUISI, for his excellent work, and I appreciate the efforts of members on both sides of the aisle who helped bring the Puerto Rico Democracy Act to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2499. Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today as a cosponsor and to speak in strong support of H.R. 2499, The Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009, which establishes a just and fair way for Puerto Ricans to decide their relationship with the United States.

Puerto Rico has been a U.S. territory for 111 years and its residents have been U.S. citizens since 1917. Puerto Ricans have contributed immeasurably to the life of this nation in times of peace and war and have served as U.S. government officials, ambassadors, federal judges and military officers.

The island is home to nearly 4 million Americans who are subject to federal taxes as determined by law, pay income taxes on income from outside the island, as well as other taxes such as Social Security and Medicare.

Yet Puerto Ricans today still cannot vote for President of the United States and do not have full voting representation in Congress. I believe it is time for the people of Puerto Rico to decide their fate after over 100 years of political uncertainty.

H.R. 2499 would identify Puerto Rico's political status options and authorize a plebiscite process in which voters could express their preferences among those options. This bill will finally give them the opportunity to determine their relationship with the U.S. in the context of a fair, neutral and democratic process sponsored by Congress.

We must ensure that the views of all Puerto Ricans are heard on this fundamental question without excluding or favoring any status option. As a cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation, I support a fair and impartial process of self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chair, I share Thomas Jefferson's belief that majority rule is "the vita principle of republics," therefore I am opposed to passage of H.R. 2499; and respectfully request that my name be withdrawn as a co-sponsor. I was mistaken in co-sponsoring this bill because it is not apparent from the language of the bill that it allows Puerto Rico to decide its future by less than a majority vote. I have also learned that current law enables Puerto Rico to hold an election to determine their future at any time, so this law is redundant—and we already have far too many redundant unnecessary laws on the books. For these reasons I would ask that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of this bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 2499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009".

SEC. 2. FEDERALLY SANCTIONED PROCESS FOR PUERTO RICO'S SELF-DETERMINATION.

(a) *FIRST PLEBISCITE.*—The Government of Puerto Rico is authorized to conduct a plebiscite in Puerto Rico. The 2 options set forth on the ballot shall be preceded by the following statement: "Instructions: Mark one of the following 2 options:

"(1) Puerto Rico should continue to have its present form of political status. If you agree, mark here ____."

"(2) Puerto Rico should have a different political status. If you agree, mark here ____."

(b) *PROCEDURE IF MAJORITY IN FIRST PLEBISCITE FAVORS OPTION 1.*—If a majority of the ballots in the plebiscite are cast in favor of Option 1, the Government of Puerto Rico is authorized to conduct additional plebiscites under subsection (a) at intervals of every 8 years from the date that the results of the prior plebiscite are certified under section 3(d).

(c) *PROCEDURE IF MAJORITY IN FIRST PLEBISCITE FAVORS OPTION 2.*—If a majority of the ballots in a plebiscite conducted pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) are cast in favor of Option 2, the Government of Puerto Rico is authorized to conduct a plebiscite on the following 3 options:

(1) *Independence:* Puerto Rico should become fully independent from the United States. If you agree, mark here ____.

(2) *Sovereignty in Association with the United States:* Puerto Rico and the United States

should form a political association between sovereign nations that will not be subject to the Territorial Clause of the United States Constitution. If you agree, mark here ____.

(3) *Statehood:* Puerto Rico should be admitted as a State of the Union. If you agree, mark here ____.

SEC. 3. APPLICABLE LAWS AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.

(a) *APPLICABLE LAWS.*—All Federal laws applicable to the election of the Resident Commissioner shall, as appropriate and consistent with this Act, also apply to any plebiscites held pursuant to this Act. Any reference in such Federal laws to elections shall be considered, as appropriate, to be a reference to the plebiscites, unless it would frustrate the purposes of this Act.

(b) *RULES AND REGULATIONS.*—The Puerto Rico State Elections Commission shall issue all rules and regulations necessary to carry out the plebiscites under this Act.

(c) *ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE.*—Each of the following shall be eligible to vote in any plebiscite held under this Act:

(1) All eligible voters under the electoral laws in effect in Puerto Rico at the time the plebiscite is held.

(2) All United States citizens born in Puerto Rico who comply, to the satisfaction of the Puerto Rico State Elections Commission, with all Commission requirements (other than the residency requirement) applicable to eligibility to vote in a general election in Puerto Rico. Persons eligible to vote under this subsection shall, upon timely request submitted to the Commission in compliance with any terms imposed by the Electoral Law of Puerto Rico, be entitled to receive an absentee ballot for the plebiscite.

(d) *CERTIFICATION OF PLEBISCITE RESULTS.*—The Puerto Rico State Elections Commission shall certify the results of any plebiscite held under this Act to the President of the United States and to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

(e) *ENGLISH BALLOTS.*—The Puerto Rico State Elections Commission shall ensure that all ballots used for any plebiscite held under this Act include the full content of the ballot printed in English.

(f) *PLEBISCITE COSTS.*—All costs associated with any plebiscite held under this Act (including the printing, distribution, transportation, collection, and counting of all ballots) shall be paid for by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 111-468. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 111-468.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Ms. Foxx:

Page 4, line 5, strike "3" and insert "4".

Page 4, after line 16, insert the following:

(4) *Commonwealth:* Puerto Rico should continue to have its present form of political status. If you agree, mark here ____.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment because it corrects the chief concern I have had about this bill—that Commonwealth is not given fair treatment in the base bill, H.R. 2499.

A cleaner process would have allowed all of the possible options to be on the ballot in one vote, with Commonwealth included.

In the first vote where one is asked to choose the status quo or change, first of all the deck is stacked against commonwealth, by those who support statehood, independence or free association.

I have reason to believe that most Puerto Ricans want Commonwealth with new enhancements, which is not the status quo. Therefore someone even voting for change in the first ballot might still have Commonwealth as their preference. But they would have no opportunity to vote for it. This is grossly unfair to what I think is the majority of the population.

H.R. 2499 is slanted toward statehood. For every option to have a level playing field Commonwealth must be added in the second vote.

I urge my colleagues to support the Foxx amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 15 seconds to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

After being engaged in the spirited debate surrounding this bill, I am pleased to report that both supporters and opponents of the underlying bill, regardless of partisanship, can support the amendment I am offering. It's my belief that Congress has no business considering this bill at this time.

Puerto Ricans have voted on statehood three times without congressional action. Although congressional action is not needed, statehood advocates have defined this bill as necessary to providing a "congressionally sanctioned" vote process for Puerto Rico to determine its political status. However, if we are going to do this, we need to pass a bill that ensures fair consideration of all points of view.

Although the bill is being touted as one to allow Puerto Ricans the opportunity to exercise political self-determination, as it's currently written it denies commonwealth status quo supporters freedom to vote for their preferred option in the second stage of the plebiscite.

In the first stage of the plebiscite, Puerto Ricans are given two choices:

the status quo or change. It's easy to see how anyone, even Commonwealth status quo supporters, would support some sort of change in their political processes. However, consensus on this question would move to a second stage, where Puerto Ricans choose only from three options: statehood, independence, or sovereignty in association with the United States. These three options deny supporters of continuing the Commonwealth status quo the freedom to vote for their preferred political status. Whether they support statehood, independence, or the Commonwealth status quo, Puerto Ricans' views should be given equal and fair consideration.

My amendment very simply adds a fourth option: "Commonwealth: Puerto Rico should continue to have its present form of political status to the available voting options for the second stage of the plebiscite."

□ 1530

This amendment takes nothing from the bill, but adds an option to reflect the views held by a significant portion of Puerto Ricans who should not be disenfranchised by this bill. This is an amendment Members of all persuasions can support. Opponents of the bill can remain opposed, but take comfort in knowing the bill was made a little better. Supporters, or even cosponsors, can take comfort in knowing their bill was made even better.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill was carefully crafted to give the people of Puerto Rico the opportunity to inform Congress for the first time ever whether they want to continue with their current temporary status, Commonwealth, or move to a permanent status: statehood, independence, or free association. This amendment would subvert this effort by including a choice to continue the island's present status among the options provided for in the bill's second plebiscite. Adoption of this amendment will contradict the bill's intent and make it less likely that the people of Puerto Rico would seek a permanent nonterritorial status.

Debate over Puerto Rico's status continues to be the central issue in politics on the island. The fairest and simplest way, we believe, to address this concern is to let Puerto Ricans choose to either retain their present status, as the underlying bill does; or, if they don't want to, allow them to elect to become a state, an independent country, or a free nation with association with the U.S. Allowing the choice of retaining their current status after it was rejected in the first plebiscite, as this amendment would do, only serves to confuse the process and would likely cause an inconclusive outcome.

I, therefore, urge defeat of the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, my colleague says this bill has been carefully crafted. Yes, it's been carefully crafted to keep the people who want the present status from being a choice. That is wrong. That should not be the way this bill is done. If they want to keep the present status, they should be able to vote for it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Could I inquire, Mr. Chairman, as to how much time I have left?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill as it is crafted is not the right way to go for the people of Puerto Rico. I don't have a dog in this fight. I have not taken a position on whether they should have statehood or not have statehood, but I don't like the Congress of the United States being used to create a situation that disenfranchises people. And that's what's happening.

We are wasting our time doing this. We don't need to do it. The people of Puerto Rico can vote on this without our doing this. We should be dealing with what is important to the American people—jobs and other issues. This is not necessary for us to do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I'd just encourage my colleagues to listen to the argument on the other side. They don't want the status quo to be one of the options. This is supposed to be a bill about self-determination, yet it's this Congress that's going to force its will to determine what is even going to be on the ballot. This is fundamentally wrong. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire again as to how much time is left on my side?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a commendable effort to try and improve a deeply flawed piece of legislation, and I really thank the gentlewoman for being so committed to providing for a process of self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico. Elections are only democratic if the people are not blocked from choosing between all the options potentially available to them. One of the many shortcomings of this bill is that under the scheme it establishes, the second ballot will not include commonwealth as an option for voters.

Again, because what they want is for the people of Puerto Rico to vote for statehood instead of providing a fair, democratic process. That is undemocratic. It is un-American. That defies imagination. That is essentially telling the people of Puerto Rico that the system of government under which they currently live is not even an option for them to consider.

This approach ignores the fact that the Commonwealth is what the majority of the people of Puerto Rico have selected in the last three previous popular votes. The amendment offered by the gentlelady will take a good first step forward, and I am wholeheartedly in support of that amendment.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to say that I think the Congress of the United States is being used unfairly in this process. We do not need to be doing this. What the proponents of statehood are doing is rigging the process in favor of a vote for statehood and they're using the Congress of the United States to establish the process for them. We don't need to be passing this bill. The people of Puerto Rico can vote without this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Before I yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico to close on our side, let me just address one issue the gentlelady from North Carolina raised about us having other issues that she alluded to which are more important than this issue to address in Congress, like jobs, the economy, et cetera; therefore, why are we considering this legislation. That may be true.

Certainly, jobs and the economy are very important to every one of our districts. But I think it should be worth pointing out here that it's most unfortunate that we can't get the type of bipartisan support—as much bipartisan support from the other side on those issues of jobs and the economy as we do on this particular piece of legislation.

I would yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

Mr. PIERLUISI. I rise in opposition to this amendment. The reason is rather straightforward. In a democracy, the majority rules. The threshold question, the first question that H.R. 2499 poses, is precisely to determine whether the majority of the people residing in Puerto Rico, the American citizens residing in Puerto Rico, want to remain as a territory. Once the majority speaks, we will abide by that. If the majority says they want change, they do not want to continue being a territory, called a commonwealth as it is, then it is only fair to ask a second question. Choose among the only available alternatives. The results will speak for themselves.

Some here seem to be convinced that the result will be that the people of Puerto Rico will choose statehood. It remains to be seen. We don't know the percentage. We don't know what other percentages we will have on the first vote, on the second vote. Let's allow the people of Puerto Rico to express

themselves. It is only fair. And the Congress will have the last word.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 111-468.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. GUTIERREZ:

On page 4, line 5, strike "on the following 3 options:" and insert "on the following 4 options:".

On page 4, after line 16, insert the following:

"(4) None of the Above. If you agree, mark here _____."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Well, here we go again. They say this is a bill. The chairman of Natural Resources says this is a bill to make sure that the people of Puerto Rico are able to define their future and do it in a free, objective manner. Really? Well, the last time they had a plebiscite in Puerto Rico, guess which option won? None of the above. Guess which option they exclude? The winning option in the last plebiscite. So who's kidding who in this place?

They have this thing rigged from the beginning to the end. If not, if they were so faithful to the wishes, to the will, to the passion of the self-determination of the people of Puerto Rico, why aren't they including the very option that won? They say they respect the decision of American citizens on the island of Puerto Rico and we should give them an opportunity to express themselves freely in a referendum. Guess what? They did. And yet we reject the very option that they chose for themselves.

What kind of democracy is that? I don't know what kind of democracy that is in other States, but I know how I feel about it. None-of-the-above, for me, offers this wonderful opportunity to the people of Puerto Rico.

Just so that we understand, because everybody says things, I want to read this. This is what the Democrats say about my amendment—my own party:

you mislead voters into thinking there is a legally better alternative to Puerto Rico's political status other than an independent state or a sovereignty. Me? Me? I'm misleading people? What is the last option that won, adopted by the government of Puerto Rico, and voted on in Puerto Rico?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House.

The Sergeant at Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I know it's hard, but the truth is the truth.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. The truth is that the last time one of the alternatives was exactly what I offer. If you really believe and you really trust and you really respect the judgment of the people of Puerto Rico, then include it as they included it when they were able to do it. If you say you're not imposing your will on them, then give them the option when they had the ability to choose the different options. I'm not asking for anything else other than that because I think that it is important and fundamental that we check into the history books.

Notice, no one, no one will contradict the fact that "none of the above" was the one that won, that that was one of the offers. And then they say that I mislead. I don't mislead anybody. The fact is, people say I'm doing this and that. That's okay. People like me, who defend the sovereign rights of the people of Puerto Rico, you know what happens to them in Puerto Rico? They get files on them by the Government of Puerto Rico. They get jailed. They are made sure they lose their jobs. They get sanctioned.

Everybody always says, Oh, why aren't there more people that believe in Puerto Rican independence? There's a lot of people that believe in Puerto Rican independence. More of them don't show themselves because when they do, you know what happens? Those that support other alternatives lock them up. Let me tell you something. Careful.

□ 1545

Mr. RAHALL. I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, as was the case with the Foxx amendment, this amendment would also add a fourth option to the second ballot in the two-stage plebiscite process. I urge defeat of this amendment as well,

largely along the same lines as the earlier amendment.

"None of the above" is the ultimate and unnecessary escape clause. The proposal for its inclusion on the ballot suggests that there exists some other option for permanently resolving Puerto Rico's status in a manner compatible with the U.S. Constitution beyond the three options of independence, sovereignty in association with the United States, or statehood. Such a belief defies the conclusions of the international community, the courts, and the executive branch.

There is no other viable option than the three to be presented on the second ballot as provided for in the underlying bill. Thus, this "none of the above" amendment is not about progress, but rather inconclusiveness. Self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico should no longer be thwarted by inconclusiveness nor held captive to any pursuit for a status change not deemed viable under the U.S. Constitution or international law.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the Chair. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair and my colleagues, this amendment should pass unanimously. I don't care where you are on this issue. If you fundamentally believe that the people of Puerto Rico should be given a voice, then the voice that they should be able to allow, one of the boxes they should be allowed to check is "none of the above." Last time, 50.3 percent of the residents there voted in favor of this. It is not right for us to deny them the opportunity to check the box that says, "none of the above." This should pass unanimously.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this.

Mr. RAHALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I yield myself 1 additional minute, Mr. Chair.

I just want to make this abundantly clear to everyone, and I know that Mr. PIERLUISI, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico who used to be the attorney general in Puerto Rico, understands this to be true. And if not, I would like him to step up and just say, Luis, you've got it wrong. Please tell me that.

This is what happened in 1998: "None of the above" was the option included in the 1998 plebiscite by the very sponsor, by the very party that the proponent of the legislation that comes before us today, Mr. PIERLUISI's party. They controlled the Governorship. They controlled the House. They controlled the Senate. They set up the parameters, and they included it. Yesterday they come and say to me that I am

being misleading about what is going on. And more than that, it's the option that won.

I also say fundamentally that one of the reasons I thought it was a good option was because I thought that it wasn't fair the way it was designed and the way it was construed. So I said, You know, I don't like the construction, so you should always give the people—especially people seeking self-determination—the option to say to us, the Congress, We didn't like the way you designed it, so we reject your proposal.

So let me use the last 30 seconds with this: I want you to look at this bill, and you are going to find a section that says that over 1 million Puerto Ricans born on the island of Puerto Rico that live in the United States—not in Puerto Rico—that live in the United States are guaranteed a ballot. What does that say to you?

There is a reason they speak Spanish, ladies and gentlemen. There's a reason they love the Puerto Rican flag. There's a reason they go to the Puerto Rican Day—there's a reason. It's okay. They have a passion for their culture, for their language, for who they are and their identity. And it is affirmed by the very proponent of this legislation, who understands that they are nationals—not of Puerto Rico, which you do not represent. But you are allowing them to participate in this process because you recognize they have an inherent right to participate in the future of Puerto Rico.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the people's representative from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Puerto Rico is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I rise in opposition because some of my colleagues here have been talking about one term, "free association," being an ambiguous term. Well, there cannot be anything more ambiguous than "none of the above" when you know that all the options that are available are the four options that we have been talking about.

The first option is for Puerto Rico to continue being a territory, and we all know what a territory is. Our Constitution provides for such. Puerto Rico is an unincorporated territory. That is an option. And there are only three other possible options as a matter of settled U.S. law and international law: independence, statehood, and free association. It serves no purpose, no real purpose to include a "none of the above" option when those are the options that we all know exist for the people of Puerto Rico.

If we want to effectuate self-determination, if we want to facilitate self-determination, if we want to give a voice to Puerto Rico, to the people of Puerto Rico, with a meaningful purpose, we cannot include a "none of the above" option. That was, indeed, the

result of the last plebiscite that was done in Puerto Rico, which did not follow the bill that this House approved or the Senate failed to act upon. It added this "none of the above" option, and what happened is, to this day, nobody can understand what that means. It served no purpose. That's why I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 111-468.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. GUTIERREZ:

In the header of section 3(e), strike "ENGLISH BALLOTS" and insert "LANGUAGE OF BALLOTS".

In section 3(e), strike "printed in English" and insert "printed in Spanish. Upon request by an eligible voter, the Puerto Rico State Elections Commission shall provide said eligible voter with a ballot printed in English".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from New York, Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward amendment, and it is very important that Congress needs to be certain that the people of Puerto Rico understand what is at stake and the options before them. This amendment will make sure that the ballots for these processes are available in both Spanish and English. Through this amendment, Puerto Rico's overwhelmingly Spanish-speaking population will be able to understand the ballot and exercise their vote. Those who reside on the island but are not fluent in Spanish will still have the opportunity to cast their ballot. They simply need to request one in English.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment, and it will provide for everyone to understand such an important process that is going to have such an incredible impact on the many people who live in Puerto Rico and those who do not live in Puerto Rico. So I urge its adoption.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment would strike the requirement from the bill that a ballot include the full content of the ballot printed in English. Instead, the amendment requires ballots to be printed in Spanish. An English ballot could be obtained only by the request of a voter.

The underlying bill strikes the right balance. We did address this issue during our full committee consideration of this legislation, and the underlying bill gives rise to the printing of a unified ballot. The amendment before us undoes that balance that we struck in the full committee in consideration of this issue, and it puts the onus on an English-proficient or otherwise English ballot-preferring voter to request such a ballot.

In my opinion, this would add tremendously to the administrative processing of the ballots; it would complicate the process, and it would add cost. It would be a tremendous cost addition to the process as well, and I would, therefore, urge the defeat of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. I believe that English should be the official language of the United States of America, but that's a different issue. Let's be realistic. The people in Puerto Rico predominantly speak Spanish. Let's provide a ballot to them in Spanish so that they can know what they're voting for. And the amendment provides that if anybody wants an English ballot, they can get an English ballot. I think that's fair. I think that's reasonable. It just allows the people of Puerto Rico to know what they're voting on. I think that's a simple request.

And there is no additional cost to the people of the United States of America, because I was able to pass an amendment in the committee that said that there will be no cost to the United States taxpayers here in the continental United States.

So again, I think it's reasonable. I rise in support of this and urge its support.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I yield myself 1½ minutes of my time.

I thank Mr. CHAFFETZ and I thank the gentlelady from New York for their comments.

Why do I propose this? Because we're getting hoodwinked again. That's all that's happening here. You know what they're going to do? I'm telling you, this is just like those derivatives that they've got at Goldman Sachs. You don't know what's in it. Look into it, because it's going to blow up on you later on.

Let me tell you why. Here's what it says on page 5. It says, "English ballots—the Puerto Rico State Elections Commission shall ensure that all ballots used for any plebiscite held under this act include the full content of the ballot printed in English." That's all it says.

Now, you know why they do that; to give you the misunderstanding, right, the false sense of confidence that people are actually going to go, and there's going to be a campaign, and it's going to be conducted in English, and the people can go and take an English ballot. The fact is that the ballots in Puerto Rico are printed in Spanish. The fact is—okay, let me give you another one.

There are, like, four big newspapers—well, there were four, but the one in English went bankrupt. The ones that thrive are the ones in Spanish. Did you ever turn the TV on in Puerto Rico? Go down there. There are, like, three or four really Puerto Rican stations. As a matter of fact, public TV in Puerto Rico is in Spanish. The news is in Spanish, and we help provide some of the funding through our contributions—not the Congress of the United States necessarily.

The fact is that I am here to affirm, to affirm, and I hope that this Congress recognizes that the people of Puerto Rico are a nation. They have a language. We should respect that language, and that language is Spanish. And as we move forward, the ballots, in order for them to understand this process, should be in Spanish.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. How many more speakers does the gentleman have remaining?

Mr. RAHALL. I just have one concluding speaker.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Well, it's very clear that every time we have an amendment, they want to, like, finish it up. But that's okay. It's been unfair from the very beginning, so what's a little more unfairness.

The fact is, I was a schoolteacher there. I was an elementary schoolteacher for 2 years in Puerto Rico. Do you know how much time the children in the public school system—which we support, taxpayers of the United States support. Do you know how much time during the day they speak in English? One class out of six. You know how I know? I spent 50 minutes a day teaching them English for almost 2 years. And you know what, the students used to walk in, and they used to say, "Oh, Mr. Ingles." It was like the math class. It was like the biology class. It was like the class they didn't want to take.

But you know something, that doesn't mean that they necessarily don't love this country. It's just that they affirm who they are, and we should respect that. They're Puerto Ricans, a colony of Spain, and have Spanish as their predominant lan-

guage. Let's respect that cultural linguistic integrity in Puerto Rico.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the people's representative from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I have heard here, and it is unfortunate, some colleagues talk about this being rigged, using terms of that nature. And I can take it because I know that this is a fair bill.

Now I just heard that somehow we are opposing this amendment because of the way that this bill is drafted. Let me say for the record of this House that the language that provides for having the ballots in both Spanish and English was offered in committee, in the Committee of Natural Resources at the markup by Mr. HENRY BROWN from South Carolina who belongs to the Republican Party. And we voted on it.

The reason I am opposing this amendment is it is totally unnecessary. As a matter of local law in Puerto Rico, we need to provide the ballots in both English and Spanish, and that is what we are doing. We are just being fair. This amendment requires as an alternative that now we need to print separate ballots in English and force those who feel more comfortable with the English language to request them. It is not necessary. We oppose it. I oppose it. And that's all I'll say. I needn't say anymore.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 111-468.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, Mr. YOUNG and I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

Amend section 3(e) to read as follows:

(e) ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS.—The Puerto Rico State Elections Commission shall—

(1) ensure that all ballots used for any plebiscite held under this Act include the full content of the ballot printed in English;

(2) inform persons voting in any plebiscite held under this Act that, if Puerto Rico retains its current political status or is admitted as a State of the United States, the official language requirements of the Federal Government shall apply to Puerto Rico in

the same manner and to the same extent as throughout the United States; and

(3) inform persons voting in any plebiscite held under this Act that, if Puerto Rico retains its current political status or is admitted as a State of the United States, it is the Sense of Congress that it is in the best interest of the United States for the teaching of English to be promoted in Puerto Rico as the language of opportunity and empowerment in the United States in order to enable students in public schools to achieve English language proficiency.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is an amendment I think that everybody will embrace, at least I hope so, because it clarifies what was just discussed. I will read it to you real quickly. It says this amendment would retain the requirement that all ballots used for authorized plebiscites include the full content of the ballot printed in English as well as Spanish. It would also require the Puerto Rico State Elections Commission to inform voters in all authorized plebiscites that if Puerto Rico retains its current status or is admitted as a State that: (1) any official language requirements of the Federal Government shall apply to Puerto Rico to the same extent as throughout the United States; and (2) it is the sense of Congress that the teaching of English be promoted, not demanded or anything, but be promoted in Puerto Rico in order for English-language proficiency to be achieved.

So we are talking about making sure that everybody who votes, everybody who is involved in any kind of an official thing like a plebiscite, that they will see it in both English and Spanish. We are also pushing to promote English more than it has been in the past. I think this is an amendment that everybody should agree with.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment. This is the same amendment we had 12 years ago. It does promote Spanish and it does promote English. This is nothing new. Right now in my State we are printing our ballots in my State in different languages within the State. This is an amendment everybody should accept, except if you are just adamantly opposed to the legislation, as some people are.

I have spent some time in Puerto Rico, not as much time as some others, but I find an awful lot of Puerto Ricans who do use English. I think that is a blessing. I am one who thinks everybody should speak two or three languages if they can. This amendment is the right way to go, and all of the plebiscites will be in both languages,

not one language, so those who speak English and Spanish and those who speak Spanish and English, both of them have a right to read and understand what they are voting on. It is the right bill. It is the right amendment. Let's vote on both things.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this amendment is unnecessary, and really it masquerades a whole debate on English, and let me explain why. This amendment has essentially three components, and I will paraphrase what those components are. They talk about all ballots used in the plebiscite must be in English, number one. Number two, prospective voters are informed that the official language requirements of the Federal Government shall apply to Puerto Rico. And number three, it has a sense of Congress that it is in the best interest to promote English.

Now let me address each of those issues but let me suggest that I believe this amendment is offered to only deny a straight up-or-down vote on the issue of English as the official language.

First of all, the language that my good friend from Indiana read in support of this amendment is already in the bill. It is on page 5. It says that the plebiscite will be carried out in English. So we don't need that because it is already in the bill.

The second provision is really meaningless. That is the one that talks about Federal language requirements. We know there is no Federal requirement in this country as to English, even though 30 States have adopted that. There is no official one from the United States. There should be, but there isn't.

Finally, I will concede at least a little point. The sense of Congress language really has no statutory effect, but I will concede this: It is at least timely. Why do I say that, because just 3 days ago the Secretary of Education in Puerto Rico said: "English is taught in Puerto Rico as if it were a foreign language."

In the 2005 Census, 85 percent of Puerto Ricans said they had very little knowledge of English. As a practical matter, in the Commonwealth legislature, and in its courts and classes in public schools, Spanish is the primary language. So there is nothing in this amendment that will change that. What should have happened and didn't happen is the Rules Committee denied a straight up-or-down vote on English as official language. That was embodied in Mr. BROWN of Georgia's amendment. But unfortunately we were denied the opportunity because this is a structured rule to at least have a debate on that. If the intent of the Rules Committee is to say this is the one we should have, I totally dis-

agree with that. So for that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think the amendment speaks for itself. I think the amendment, Mr. Chairman, says very clearly that we want to make sure that everyone who casts a ballot in an election or on a plebiscite has before them the ability to understand what the ballot is about and be able to cast it intelligently. This is done in all kinds of States. As a matter of fact, many States have as many as 11 different languages, which is really out of control, on one ballot. To say you can't have two on this ballot in Puerto Rico so they can cast their ballot intelligently really doesn't make much sense.

I am a very strong advocate for making sure that everyone in this country speaks English, and I understand what my colleague just said, but in this particular case we are talking about a plebiscite that is going to be advisory for the Congress of the United States. This is just to help this process along and to make sure that it is understood by everybody.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I am happy the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) brought this amendment up. I think it should be soundly defeated, but I am happy he brought it because it just demonstrates the imperialist nature. Here we are in the empire, the Congress of the United States, plenary powers over Puerto Rico, dictating what language they have to use.

You know what, it's amazing, but I'm not surprised, Mr. BURTON, because I understand the people of Indiana are still a little angry at the people of Puerto Rico when they arrested Bobby Knight. Bobby Knight got arrested in Puerto Rico. I think this is an important story to tell you. He got arrested in Puerto Rico. There were Pan American games, and the basketball team from the United States was competing against the basketball team from Cuba, and Bobby Knight went into a rage because all of the fans in the stadium in Puerto Rico, all American citizens, were clapping and cheering for the Cuban team and not the American team. So he said to himself: What's wrong with these people? And he threw a chair, as he likes to do, and he got arrested. There is an arrest warrant, and I don't know, maybe Mr. PIERLUISI can tell us if the arrest warrant is still valid and out there since he was the attorney general. It just tells you they're a nation, they're a people, and they affirm who they are in every instance.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I don't know what that has to do with anything, but I yield to Mr. PIERLUISI for 1 minute.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I rise in support of this amendment. It is a sensible

amendment. It basically provides that whatever legal requirements apply in the States will apply in Puerto Rico on this issue.

At the same time, it expresses a sense of Congress that we should improve the teaching of English in Puerto Rico. I am all for that. Ninety percent of the parents in Puerto Rico want to improve the teaching of English in Puerto Rico to their children. I have two bills pending before this Congress seeking additional funding, one, and the other creating a teacher exchange program so that we have more English teachers in Puerto Rico.

This is not an issue. We have two official languages in Puerto Rico, English and Spanish, the same way Hawaii has two official languages. We want all of our children to be fluent in English and to facilitate the government processes in Puerto Rico to the extent necessary so any English speakers will be well served.

So I support the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Indiana as well as the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have 1 minute left and I have the right to close; is that correct?

The CHAIR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN).

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment because it is a hollow amendment. No territory with an official language other than English has ever been admitted to the Union. Why this time?

Instead of reporting the English amendment I offered as a condition of statehood, the Rules Committee reported out a much watered down alternative English amendment which is opposed by every major pro-English group in the country. Unlike my amendment which required English as a condition of statehood, the Burton-Young amendment only encourages English to be taught without any enforcement.

Further, this amendment states that if Puerto Rico is admitted to the United States, the official language requirements of the Federal Government shall apply to Puerto Rico to the extent as throughout the United States. We don't have anything. That's totally useless.

This would be a great provision if the United States had an official language. Unfortunately, we do not. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will take my last 30 seconds to say that the gentleman from Georgia has a very strong accent, but I understand him.

I would just like to say that this is a clarifying amendment to make sure that everybody who votes down there in a plebiscite or in an election has be-

fore them the ability to understand and cast the vote intelligently. I can't understand why anybody would be opposed to this. It makes common sense, and I hope everybody will support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time, which is 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, the pertinent part of this amendment is already in the bill, and that speaks to the ballot; the other two are really meaningless. Frankly, this amendment does not even need to be considered today; but if it's a cover, then it's a cover, and let's call it what it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 111-468.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Page 5, strike line 8 and all that follows through "Persons eligible" on line 13 and insert the following:

(2) An individual residing outside of Puerto Rico, if the individual—

(A)(i) is a resident of the United States, including a resident of any territory, possession, or military or civilian installation of the United States, at the time the plebiscite is held; and

(ii) would be eligible to vote in the plebiscite but for the individual's residency outside of Puerto Rico;

(B) was born in Puerto Rico; or

(C) has at least one parent who was born in Puerto Rico.

This paragraph shall apply notwithstanding any rule or regulation issued under subsection (b). Persons eligible

Page 6, after line 7, add the following:

(g) RECOGNITION OF RIGHT TO VOTE.—Congress recognizes the right of Puerto Ricans residing outside of Puerto Rico to vote in any plebiscite held under this Act and requests the Commonwealth Elections Commission of Puerto Rico to devise methods and procedures for such Puerto Ricans, including those born in, or having at least one parent born in, Puerto Rico, to register for and vote in absentia.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, today the nation of Puerto Rico is 8 million people strong; 4 million reside on islands of Puerto Rico and 4 million live in the United States.

From Florida to New York City to Chicago to California, and everywhere in between, there are Puerto Rican communities across our Nation. Those Puerto Ricans who have been born in the United States are no less Puerto Rican than the ones that reside on the island. All of us, regardless of where we were born or raised, have a deep and abiding connection with our cultural home.

Puerto Ricans raised on the mainland often speak Spanish. They are taught about their culture, history, and where they come from. There are Puerto Rico Day parades in New York City, Chicago, Orlando, Hartford, and cities across this land. Regardless of where they were born, all Puerto Ricans are deeply vested in the political future of the island. I was born and raised in Puerto Rico, but that does not make me more Puerto Rican than Mr. GUTIERREZ.

Clearly, there is an air bridge between the United States and Puerto Rico. Puerto Ricans have relatives and family members living in Puerto Rico. And those Puerto Ricans living in the States possess their own sense of identity, which is shaped by and tied to Puerto Rico.

This amendment would allow Puerto Ricans living on the mainland to participate in the plebiscite that is called for under the bill. Importantly, the amendment requires that those wishing to vote be able to prove, by birth certificate, that they have at least one parent born in Puerto Rico. This will provide a safeguard against voter fraud while ensuring that we do not disenfranchise Puerto Ricans living in the States from this process.

Mr. Chairman, Puerto Ricans living on the mainland are no less Puerto Rican than those born and raised on the islands. We should not deny them a voice or a vote as this process, which is so important to the Puerto Rican nation, moves forward. These Puerto Ricans cannot be denied their right of self-determination.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Puerto Rico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. The bill before us is a product of careful deliberation. We worked hard in reaching the right and correct balance in terms of determining who should be eligible to vote in the plebiscites provided for in the bill.

Before reporting it, the committee considered, as we had in previous Puerto Rico status bills, which voters should be participating, and we had to strike a balance. The bill makes both

residents of Puerto Rico who are otherwise eligible to vote under Puerto Rico electoral law and U.S. citizens who were born in Puerto Rico but who may not reside in the territory at the time of the plebiscite eligible to vote.

The committee recognized that a substantial number of individuals born in Puerto Rico but not currently residing there hope to return to live in Puerto Rico one day. Accordingly, they can be said to have a practical stake in helping to determine Puerto Rico's future political status. Such argument does not hold, though, for those who are of Puerto Rican descent but who were born outside of the territory, which the pending amendment would allow. The bill chooses place of birth rather than ethnic identity as the eligibility criteria. I urge this criterion to be maintained and that this amendment be rejected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Puerto Rico has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) such time as he may consume.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the gentlelady.

Well, let's have a little talk here. There's a difference: here's citizenship, here's nationality, here's citizenship, here's nationality. They should not be confused. Ask the people in Ireland; they were subjects of the Queen; therefore, they were citizens. But they were always Irish. Ask the people of Ukraine. They may have been subjects of the Soviet Union and citizens of the Soviet Union and have a passport, but they never stopped being Ukrainian, they never stopped being Lithuanian. Look what happened in Yugoslavia once you got rid of Tito. We all saw everybody engage in their national pride. That's what we do, too: we assert it.

As a matter of fact, the very proponents of this legislation affirm that I'm right, they recognize it; otherwise, why would you allow people outside of the jurisdiction of Puerto Rico to vote and to determine its future unless you invested in them, unless they inherently had in themselves the nationality of Puerto Rican?

The gentleman from Puerto Rico says separation from ethnicity. I'm not an ethnic Puerto Rican. I might be a lot more Puerto Rican than some Puerto Ricans are. I suggest the gentleman come to my city of Chicago. In the Puerto Rican community there are many American flags, but there are two huge Puerto Rican flags. Don't divide the Puerto Rican nation; it is a nation of people. It may decide that it wants to incorporate itself into the United States of America, but it always is a nation of people with the inalienable right to independence. Don't divide our community.

If you look at my birth certificate, it says Puerto Rico twice on it—mom born in Puerto Rico, dad born in Puerto Rico. Then it says Chicago, Illinois. Nine months earlier, I would have been in Puerto Rico, so I'm separated by 9 months. And yet every fabric of who I am has a relationship to that wonderful, beautiful island: its music, its artistry, its poetry, its patriots. As a matter of fact, one of the most beautiful songs ever written about Puerto Rico was written in the United States of America and the longing for returning to that island.

Just think a moment, just think, think of the exodus of Puerto Ricans that left Puerto Rico in the 1950s during Operation Bootstrap. What did they do? Did they come to the United States and say, oh, great, we're in the United States; we're going to stay here forever and die here? No. The longing was to return one day to that island. Allow them the vote on the future of that island.

Mr. PIERLUISI. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PIERLUISI. In listening to the gentleman from Illinois, I keep hearing that he wants Puerto Rico to become independent, that he sees Puerto Rico as a nation. So be it. That's a dignified status, and that is one of the options that this bill provides for.

In crafting the bill, we tried to be as inclusive as we could, recognizing that Puerto Ricans, people born in Puerto Rico, might be interested in participating in this plebiscite, might want to return to Puerto Rico; and for the purpose of being as fair and as democratic as we could, we drew the line on requiring birth in Puerto Rico. More than that, we think it would be too encompassing and not necessary.

So I oppose this amendment. I believe that the current bill is fair; it might not be perfect, like any piece of legislation. You draw lines when you're legislating, but this is a reasonable line.

I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 111-468.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Page 3, strike line 8 and all that follows through line 5 on page 4 and insert the following:

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT PLEBISCITE.—The Government of Puerto Rico is authorized to conduct a plebiscite on the following 4 options:

Page 4, after line 16, insert the following:

(4) Commonwealth: Puerto Rico should continue to have its present form of political status. If you agree, mark here ____.

(b) RUNOFF PROCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If no option receives votes on more than 50 percent of the ballots cast, the Government of Puerto Rico shall conduct a runoff process to permit voters to select among the 2 options that received the most votes.

(2) OPTION TO SELECT NONE OF THE ABOVE.—In a runoff process conducted under this subsection, voters shall be permitted to vote for—

(A) the option that received the most votes;

(B) the option that received the second most votes; or

(C) neither of those options.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong believer that the people are smart enough to make tough decisions if they are presented with all the facts clearly and objectively. This legislation does not provide a transparent process of the choices available to Puerto Rico. That is not democracy by any definition.

A true system of democracy does not preclude certain options from a ballot, nor does it structure votes in a way to manipulate an electorate. Unfortunately, as we all know, this legislation structures the votes in a way that will prevent a commonwealth option from receiving fair consideration.

The process that allowed for the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was adopted by Congress. It is a legitimate form of government that is accepted by millions. I, therefore, find it appalling that this Congress will consider precluding a commonwealth as an option for the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, joining our Union as a new State is not a step that should result from electoral tricks or engineering. Joining the United States of America must be a decision that a people undertake deliberately, knowingly, and voluntarily. If the people of Puerto Rico wish to become a State, that option should be able to prevail against all other choices. The people should affirm, in a single vote, that they wish to move in that direction. They should not be presented with a series of false choices that are rigged to force the electorate into choosing statehood.

Under this amendment, there would be an opportunity for a real vote, with all the options on the table. This

amendment eliminates the first round vote and adds commonwealth as a choice for voters. It also provides for a runoff process if no option receives a majority of votes.

If the supporters of statehood and the authors of this bill truly believe that they have the will of the people on their side, then this amendment should cause them no concern. All this amendment will do is provide a chance for the people to vote on the future of the island with all the options before them, including commonwealth. To effectively preclude commonwealth from this process is to deny the Puerto Rican people a true right to self-determination.

I urge you to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Puerto Rico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment because I believe it will muddy the waters of an otherwise clear choice that would be presented to the voters of Puerto Rico.

I also rise with tremendous respect for my colleagues and friends, Congresswoman NYDIA VELÁZQUEZ and Congressman LUIS GUTIERREZ, while at the same time rising in strong support of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act.

Puerto Rico has been a U.S. territory for 111 years, and its residents have been U.S. citizens since 1917. Puerto Ricans have a rich history of service to our Nation. They have served honorably in our military as Federal officials and as ambassadors. Our newest member of the Supreme Court, Justice Sonia Sotomayor, is of Puerto Rican descent. Yet, in all of this time, the people of Puerto Rico have never been given the chance to express their views about the island's political relationship with the United States in a meaningful vote sponsored by Congress.

Because H.R. 2499 embodies the commitment to democracy that defines our Nation, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes."

I am proud that 20 of the bill's cosponsors hail from my State of Florida. The bill has received overwhelming bipartisan support from my State's delegation because of the close relationship between Florida and Puerto Rico. My district alone is home to more than 30,000 individuals of Puerto Rican descent, many of whom travel frequently to the island to visit family members. Companies in my district and across Florida regularly conduct business with those located in Puerto Rico.

Despite the close family and business ties that bind many in my district with

Puerto Rico, our two peoples are different in one critical respect: The residents of Puerto Rico, despite being citizens of the United States, cannot vote for President and do not have voting representation in Congress. They also cannot access all Federal programs to the same extent as can the residents of the States.

H.R. 2499 would at long last give the people of Puerto Rico this opportunity. The bill authorizes the government of Puerto Rico to conduct an initial plebiscite. Voters would be asked whether they wished to maintain the current status or to choose a different status. The rationale for this plebiscite is simple.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. The issue here is not if the people of Puerto Rico can vote or not in Presidential elections. The issue here is a true, transparent, democratic process for the Puerto Rican people to participate in a referendum without imposing statehood.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, in reclaiming my time, I believe that this legislation would at long last give the people of Puerto Rico the opportunity that they have not been given before. It authorizes the government of Puerto Rico to conduct an initial plebiscite. It gives the people of Puerto Rico a chance to weigh in on whether they wish to keep their status the same or to change their status.

Congress needs to give the people of Puerto Rico access to participatory democracy, and this legislation does exactly that. It will create a process for the citizens of Puerto Rico to decide their own political status. If the majority of voters cast their ballots in favor of a different political status, the government of Puerto Rico would be authorized to conduct a second plebiscite which would include independence or statehood.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on H.R. 2499.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I agree that the people of Puerto Rico deserve the opportunity to have a process whereby they can indicate their status preference, but I also agree that the way the vote is set up in the base bill is slanted towards a statehood outcome. This is the third Puerto Rico status bill that has been introduced since I've been in Congress, and while I consider H.R. 2499 to come closest to providing a plebiscite in which all options would be equally treated, it is not quite there yet.

Whether one supports commonwealth or improvements of the current commonwealth or not, I think everyone would agree that the process should be fair and that it should enable the people of Puerto Rico to express their preference for clear, equally treated options. This amendment does that, and I think the runoff with the two receiving the most votes and none of the above provides an additional level that ensures that no one is forced to choose between options, neither of which they support.

I look forward to supporting the status option that the people of Puerto Rico select, but I would have reservations in doing so if it were arrived at through a flawed process. This amendment is an attempt to fix that flaw, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I will simply say that the authors of this bill are not afraid of having the people of Puerto Rico freely express themselves in a process that is democratic and that is transparent. They should support this amendment. Yet, if they are afraid that the only way they can get a simple majority that supports statehood is by denying the people of Puerto Rico the choice to vote for commonwealth, they know that history is on the side of the people of Puerto Rico. Repeatedly, every time plebiscites have been conducted in Puerto Rico, the commonwealth status has won, and statehood has been defeated. That is why they are so afraid, and that is why they are denying the right of the people of Puerto Rico to true self-determination.

I urge my colleagues to support and to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

This amendment would replace the plebiscite process authorized by the bill with an entirely new process, including a runoff with a problematic none-of-the-above option, which is unsound, confusing, and unlikely to produce a clear expression of the voters' views on the status question.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. The amendment would delete the two-step process authorized by the bill, and it would replace it with a one-step process that uses the term "commonwealth" to denote Puerto Rico's current status.

As I said before, the term "commonwealth" is the legal name. It is the title given to the territory of Puerto Rico. Including the term when giving the people of Puerto Rico an option is confusing in and of itself, particularly because it could imply that it is more than what it is. This has been debated long enough. A territory is a territory is a territory. Call it whatever you may.

By limiting the plebiscites I authorize to one, the amendment fails to accomplish one of the primary purposes

of the bill: to determine whether the people of Puerto Rico consent to an arrangement that, whatever its other merits, does not provide them with self-government at the national level. The amendment includes a runoff process that provides for a none-of-the-above option. By including this option, the amendment undermines the purpose of the legislation, which is to enable a fair and informed process of self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico. "None of the above" is not a valid status. The last plebiscite provided that, and to this day, we cannot even interpret it. Including it on any ballot misleads voters into thinking that there is a possible alternative to the three available options.

I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 111-468.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Congress respects the self-determination right of the people of Puerto Rico to choose their future relationship to the United States.

(2) Congress pledges not to dissuade, influence, or dictate a status option to the people of Puerto Rico.

(3) Congress will respectfully postpone consideration of the Puerto Rico status question until it receives an official proposal from the people of Puerto Rico to revise the current relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States that was made through a democratically held process by direct ballot.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Puerto Rico can proceed to conduct a plebiscite in Puerto Rico. The 2 options set forth on the ballot may be preceded by the following statement: "Instructions: Mark one of the following 2 options:

"(1) Puerto Rico should conduct a plebiscite to determine a future proposal for the political status of Puerto Rico. If you agree, mark here ____.

"(2) Puerto Rico should NOT conduct a plebiscite to determine a future proposal for

the political status of Puerto Rico. If you agree, mark here ____."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to express the sense of Congress that the Government of Puerto Rico can proceed to conduct a plebiscite in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, self-determination is a basic concept in a democracy. The ability of a people to choose their own national grouping without undue influence from another country is rightly recognized as a core element of freedom and liberty. Today, sadly, we are debating legislation that turns its back on this principle.

Perhaps what is most unfortunate is that what we are debating today involves imposing ideas from the outside onto the island. It seems to me, if we wish to keep faith with the democratic tradition of self-determination, then we will look for the guide to Puerto Rico's future, not in the House of Congress and not in Washington, D.C., but in Puerto Rico.

The amendment that I am offering will honor the concept of self-determination. This amendment empowers the people of Puerto Rico to submit their own proposal for moving forward. The amendment expresses the sense of Congress that we should not proceed until we have heard from those most affected by this debate, the Puerto Rican people. The residents of Puerto Rico should exercise freely and without congressional interference. The right to self-determination and this amendment recognize their rights. Rather than having Congress approve a bill that says to the Puerto Rican people that their relationship with the United States must change, this amendment sends a different message. It says to the Puerto Rican nation: We trust you to decide your future.

If they envision a better alternative than the status quo, then let them come to Congress and tell us. That is true self-determination. That is a process that will be viewed as legitimate by all parties in Puerto Rico, and it is a far cry from a bill that forces the Puerto Rican people to take a series of sham votes which are aimed at achieving a predetermined outcome.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to honor the democratic tradition of self-determination. I urge Members to vote "yes" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does nothing to further the goal of H.R. 2499, which is to provide the people of Puerto Rico with a federally recognized process to allow them to freely express their wishes regarding

their future political status in a congressionally recognized referendum.

The amendment recognizes that Puerto Rico can conduct a plebiscite on whether to conduct a plebiscite on a status option or options, and it calls on Congress to "respectfully postpone consideration" of the issue until it receives a proposal for revision of the current U.S.-Puerto Rican relationship voted for by Puerto Ricans.

We are all aware of the fact that Puerto Rico can conduct its own plebiscites. There is no disputing this fact. In fact, they have done so multiple times in the past, most recently in 1998, but because some of those were local referenda, which included definitions of the various status choices that were inaccurate and likely not to be supported by Congress, the results were inclusive, which brings us to the need of the bill pending before us.

We have an obligation to provide the people of Puerto Rico with a process that, more likely than not, will lead to a final resolution of the question of their political status, a question with which we have been grappling for more than a century. The amendment of the gentlewoman fails this test, and, for this reason, it should be defeated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the gentlewoman. We have been working very closely together.

Mr. Chairman, this is a wonderfully crafted amendment, but I think that it is very important that the Congress respects the self-determination of the people of Puerto Rico to choose their future relationship with the United States or without the United States but to decide their future relationship.

This is the key pledge: Congress pledges not to dissuade, to influence, or to dictate a status option to the people of Puerto Rico.

Look, in my first election in Puerto Rico, I represented the Puerto Rican Independence Party. I was 19 years old in San Sebastian del Pepino. I was a delegate for that party until the first election. There was one vote for the Puerto Rican Independence Party in my polling place, what they call "Integro"—right?—just for independence. That was mine at that point.

I went to the university. I used to sell Claridad when I was at the university, and I would sell it to others. I've been a proponent of Puerto Rican independence. I got a nice, little carpeta, too—right?—and I haven't called the FBI yet to see what long list of things they've written down about me and who I've associated with, but let me tell you something:

The gentleman from Puerto Rico knows that everything is not all fair and square in Puerto Rico. There is an adage in Puerto Rico—right?—which is

don't get together with those people or you will be fingered. Do you know what? 1.8 million pages. You know, my dad was right. They had figured us out. They had said who we were. Do you know what would happen? You couldn't get a job. You couldn't be a teacher. You couldn't be anybody prominent in the society of Puerto Rico.

So I am here to say, for all of those who fought for the independence of Puerto Rico and for its right to join as a sovereign nation in the world of nations, don't do this. Don't dictate.

□ 1645

Please note that although I have always been an advocate, I have never come before this Congress to dictate my opinion, to dictate an outcome which benefits me. Let me tell you something. You think you've got a definition for the commonwealth that you can destroy? I have got a definition for independence that I can sell also. But I think it would be wrong to do it. I think it would be unfair to do it.

What the gentlewoman from New York is simply doing here is saying return this process to the people of Puerto Rico.

As I come up here every time, "Founding Fathers," "Founding Fathers," "Founding Fathers." Then they ask you who is your favorite Founding Father? And no one can name one.

Let me tell you something about the Founding Fathers. They had a Constitutional Convention. Let's allow the spirit of the Founding Fathers to act in Puerto Rico.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI).

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York.

This amendment is in the nature of a substitute and seeks to postpone an informed self-determination process along the viable status options in Puerto Rico. Postpone. Delay.

We've waited long enough. We have been waiting for 112 years.

In addition, it basically opts out. This is an opt-out. Congress is basically saying I'm not going to deal with this. Easy for Congress to do, but it is not the right thing.

Congress should be engaged in this process like it has never done before. Why? There are 4 million American citizens living in that territory, and they are being discriminated against every day in legislation that is pending before the Congress. If they want to live under those conditions, so be it. They should tell this Congress. But if they want a different status, nonterritorial, they should be given the chance also to express themselves along those lines. And the options are clear.

The gentleman from Illinois, it looks like he favors one of those options, independence for Puerto Rico. He keeps

talking about Puerto Rico's being a nation and so on. I respect that. If that's the will of the majority of the people of Puerto Rico, I am sure this Congress will respect it as well. But there are two other options. Yes, free association, it has been done before, and in Puerto Rico, people know very well what free association is all about. And the other one is statehood. There has been lots of talk about statehood here. And what I tell to all those who have raised concerns about the potential admission of Puerto Rico as a State is that we're not there yet. When we get there, then we will address it. But at least this bill allows the people of Puerto Rico to express their will. What is more democratic than that? What is fairer than that? Nothing. To simply say we're not going to get involved in this, solve it among yourselves, easy way out, but that's not fair. We've waited long enough.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 111-468.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order under the rule.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Puerto Rico Plebiscite Act of 2010".

SEC. 2. PLEBISCITE.

Puerto Rico has and has had the authority to conduct a plebiscite of its residents on its future political status and to transmit the result to Congress.

Amend the long title so as to read: "A bill to clarify Puerto Rico plebiscite authority."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1305, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the debate here has centered largely on the procedure by

which citizens of Puerto Rico should, if they desire, become a State. I am of the opinion and what this amendment does is to state very specifically that the citizens of Puerto Rico have within their power to make that determination. I think that is the proper way to go.

But I also believe that the amendment that just passed by a voice vote, the Velázquez amendment, accomplishes the same thing. So I don't want to be redundant, and in a moment, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask if I can have this amendment withdrawn.

But before I do that, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to make a couple of comments before we end this debate, as we will very, very soon.

I know that everybody thinks this is about self-determination. If it were truly about self-determination, why are the other two parties in Puerto Rico opposed to the bill? Why is it that all those who believe in independence are opposed to the bill? Why are those that believe in commonwealth opposed to the bill? If there is such consensus, if the gentleman truly represents the will of the people of Puerto Rico, why are the other two parties opposed to the bill? And that's a very important question that we ask ourselves.

Secondly, Mr. PIERLUISI acknowledged, just so that we have it all, in the Puerto Rican media, that he didn't seek the opinions of the opposition party with regards to this bill because it would have been, according to him, una perdida de tiempo. That means "a waste of time."

Now, all I want to say is it isn't a waste of time. It is valuable. And that's why I am so happy that you are doing what you're doing because I think we can all gather around the gentlewoman VELÁZQUEZ and support her amendment.

Buscar consenso no es una perdida de tiempo. To seek consensus is not a waste of time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. First, Mr. Chairman, just a correction. The gentleman from Washington stated that the previous amendment passed by voice vote. We have a rollcall order on that; so I just wanted to correct that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I understand that. The chairman said that the amendment passed.

Mr. RAHALL. We do have a rollcall vote scheduled on that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. But there will be a rollcall vote.

Mr. RAHALL. Reclaiming my time, this particular amendment does nothing to fulfill our obligation to provide

a process for self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico, and it is very similar to previous amendments that have been offered today. It was my hope that when the gentleman supported reporting the bill from committee, when he voted for it back on July 22, 2009, when the bill passed out of our Natural Resources Committee on a 30-8, I see the ranking member, my good friend, the gentleman from Washington is listed as “aye” vote. It’s an “aye” vote for the pending legislation before us today.

In addition, in looking through the report here, I see no dissenting views. There are additional views, but there are no dissenting views to this bill as it came out of our Committee on Natural Resources back on July 22 of last year.

So we are where we are. Regrettably, the gentleman’s substitute does nothing to advance the goal of self-determination for the people of Puerto Rico. It states the obvious. Puerto Rico does have the authority to conduct a plebiscite on its own. It has done so on several occasions, often with confusing definitions of the alternatives. But there has never been, never been, a congressionally authorized plebiscite, one backed by the full power of the United States Congress. And that is what the underlying bill is all about. That is what our efforts are here about, showing some congressionally sanctioned approval of the Puerto Ricans’ efforts at self-determination.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In response to my good friend from West Virginia, the distinguished chairman of the committee, yes, it’s true, I voted for the bill, but there is always more to the rest of the story.

In my opening remarks, I expressed doubt that this is the proper way to go. I expressed those doubts, but I know that this issue is something that needs to be resolved. I was hoping when it got to the floor of the House it might have an open rule so it could be perfected, but I wanted to find out more about this issue, and I found out more about these issues and why now I believe I should be in opposition to it. I called Governor Fortuno last Friday and told him of my decision on that, and he was very gracious when we had that conversation.

Now, as to this amendment, as I had mentioned, I think the Velázquez amendment accomplishes what I would want to accomplish in my amendment. So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Velázquez amendment when we have the rollcall.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have my amendment withdrawn.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now re-

sume on those amendments printed in House Report 111-468 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GUTIERREZ of Illinois.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GUTIERREZ of Illinois.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York.

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 179, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

AYES—223

Aderholt	Conaway	Heller
Adler (NJ)	Cooper	Hensarling
Akin	Costello	Herger
Alexander	Courtney	Herseth Sandlin
Altmire	Cuellar	Himes
Austria	Culberson	Holden
Bachmann	Cummings	Honda
Bachus	Davis (IL)	Hunter
Bartlett	Davis (KY)	Inglis
Barton (TX)	DeLauro	Issa
Bean	Dent	Jackson (IL)
Becerra	Dreier	Jenkins
Biggert	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Ellison	Jones
Bilirakis	Ellsworth	Jordan (OH)
Bishop (GA)	Emerson	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	Fattah	Kaptur
Blackburn	Flake	Kilpatrick (MI)
Blunt	Fleming	King (IA)
Boehner	Forbes	Kingston
Bonner	Fortenberry	Kirk
Bono Mack	Foster	Kucinich
Boozman	Fox	Lamborn
Boren	Frank (MA)	Lance
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Bright	Gallely	Latta
Broun (GA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lee (NY)
Buchanan	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Burgess	Giffords	Lipinski
Buyer	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Calvert	Gohmert	Lowey
Camp	Goodlatte	Lucas
Capito	Graves	Luetkemeyer
Capuano	Green, Al	Lummis
Carney	Griffith	Mack
Carter	Guthrie	Manzullo
Cassidy	Gutierrez	Marchant
Chaffetz	Hall (NY)	Marshall
Christensen	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)
Cleaver	Halvorson	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Harman	McCauley
Coffman (CO)	Harper	McClintock
Cole	Hastings (WA)	McCollum

McCotter	Platts	Simpson
McHenry	Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)
McIntyre	Posey	Smith (NJ)
McKeon	Price (GA)	Smith (TX)
McMahon	Quigley	Souder
McMorris	Radanovich	Space
Rodgers	Rangel	Spratt
Mica	Rehberg	Stearns
Michaud	Richardson	Sullivan
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)	Terry
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)
Miller, Gary	Rogers (KY)	Thornberry
Minnick	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
Mitchell	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Moore (WI)	Rooney	Tonko
Moran (KS)	Roskam	Towns
Murphy (NY)	Ross	Turner
Murphy, Tim	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Myrick	Royce	Velázquez
Nadler (NY)	Rush	Walden
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Watt
Oberstar	Sarbanes	Weiner
Obey	Scalise	Westmoreland
Olson	Schakowsky	Whitfield
Paulsen	Schmidt	Wilson (SC)
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Wittman
Pence	Sessions	Wolf
Perriello	Shadegg	Woolsey
Peters	Sherman	Wu
Petri	Shimkus	Young (FL)
Pitts	Shuster	

NOES—179

Ackerman	Garamendi	Norton
Andrews	Gonzalez	Nye
Arcuri	Gordon (TN)	Olver
Baca	Grayson	Ortiz
Baird	Grijalva	Owens
Baldwin	Hare	Pallone
Barrow	Hastings (FL)	Pascarell
Berkley	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Berman	Higgins	Perlmutter
Berry	Hill	Peterson
Bishop (NY)	Hirono	Pierluisi
Blumenauer	Holt	Polis (CO)
Bocciari	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Bordallo	Inslee	Price (NC)
Boswell	Israel	Putnam
Boyd	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Reichert
Braley (IA)	Johnson (GA)	Rodriguez
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman (NJ)
Ginny	Kagen	Ruppersberger
Burton (IN)	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Campbell	Kildee	Sablan
Cantor	Kilroy	Salazar
Cao	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Capps	King (NY)	T.
Cardoza	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Sanchez, Loretta
Carnahan	Kissell	Schauer
Carson (IN)	Klein (FL)	Schiff
Castle	Kline (MN)	Schock
Chandler	Kosmas	Schrader
Childers	Kratovil	Schwartz
Chu	Langevin	Scott (GA)
Clarke	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Sestak
Conyers	Levin	Shea-Porter
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Crenshaw	Loebach	Skelton
Crowley	Lofgren, Zoe	Slaughter
Dahlkemper	Lujan	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lungren, Daniel	Snyder
Davis (TN)	E.	Stark
DeFazio	Lynch	Stupak
Deutch	Maffei	Sutton
Diaz-Balart, L.	Maloney	Tanner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Markey (CO)	Taylor
Dicks	Markey (MA)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Matheson	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Matsui	Titus
Donnelly (IN)	McDermott	Tsongas
Doyle	McGovern	Van Hollen
Driehaus	McNerney	Visclosky
Edwards (MD)	Meek (FL)	Walz
Edwards (TX)	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Ehlers	Miller, George	Schultz
Engel	Moore (KS)	Watson
Eshoo	Moran (VA)	Welch
Etheridge	Murphy (CT)	Yarmuth
Farr	Murphy, Patrick	Young (AK)
Filner	Napolitano	
Fudge	Neal (MA)	

NOT VOTING—34

Barrett (SC)	Brown (SC)	Castor (FL)
Boucher	Butterfield	Clay

Cohen	Hodes	Shuler
Davis (AL)	Hoekstra	Speier
DeGette	Linder	Teague
Delahunt	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Faleomavaega	Melancon	Wamp
Fallin	Mollohan	Waters
Granger	Nunes	Waxman
Green, Gene	Paul	Wilson (OH)
Hinchey	Pingree (ME)	
Hinojosa	Reyes	

□ 1729

Ms. SUTTON and Messrs. HARE, HILL, SNYDER, KLEIN of Florida, SKELTON, CONYERS, GEORGE MILLER of California, and COSTA changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. HALVORSON, and Messrs. GRIFFITH, BOOZMAN, SULLIVAN, WATT, JACKSON of Illinois, BURGESS, OLSON, AL GREEN of Texas, ELLISON, COURTNEY, and CAPUANO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 236, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

AYES—164

Aderholt	Flake	Kirk
Akin	Fleming	Kucinich
Alexander	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Austria	Fox	Lance
Bachmann	Frank (MA)	Latham
Bachus	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Bartlett	Frelinghuysen	Lee (CA)
Becerra	Gallely	Lee (NY)
Bilbray	Garrett (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Blackburn	Giffords	LoBiondo
Blunt	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Bonner	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Bono Mack	Graves	Lynch
Boozman	Griffith	Manzullo
Boustany	Grijalva	Marchant
Broun (GA)	Guthrie	Marshall
Buchanan	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Calvert	Hall (NY)	McCauley
Camp	Hall (TX)	McClintock
Capito	Hastings (WA)	McCollum
Carney	Heller	McCotter
Carter	Hensarling	McIntyre
Cassidy	Hergert	McKeon
Chaffetz	Herseeth Sandlin	McMahon
Christensen	Holden	McMorris
Coble	Honda	Rodgers
Coffman (CO)	Hunter	Miller (FL)
Conaway	Inglis	Miller (MI)
Costello	Jenkins	Miller, Gary
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Minnick
Davis (IL)	Jones	Mitchell
Davis (KY)	Jordan (OH)	Moore (WI)
Dreier	Kanjorski	Moran (KS)
Duncan	Kaptur	Murphy (NY)
Edwards (MD)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Neal (MA)
Ellison	King (IA)	Neugebauer
Ellsworth	Kingston	Paulsen

Perriello	Roskam
Petri	Roybal-Allard
Pitts	Royce
Platts	Ryan (WI)
Poe (TX)	Scalise
Posey	Schakowsky
Price (GA)	Schmidt
Quigley	Scott (GA)
Radanovich	Sensenbrenner
Rangel	Sessions
Rehberg	Shadegg
Richardson	Shimkus
Roe (TN)	Shuster
Rogers (AL)	Simpson
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Rooney	Souder

NOES—236

Ackerman	Etheridge
Adler (NJ)	Farr
Altmire	Fattah
Andrews	Forbes
Arcuri	Foster
Baca	Fudge
Baird	Garamendi
Baldwin	Gerlach
Barrow	Gonzalez
Barton (TX)	Goodlatte
Bean	Gordon (TN)
Berkley	Grayson
Berman	Green, Al
Berry	Halvorson
Biggart	Hare
Bilirakis	Harman
Bishop (GA)	Harper
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Heinrich
Blumenauer	Higgins
Boccieri	Hill
Boehner	Himes
Bordallo	Hirono
Boren	Holt
Boswell	Hoyer
Boyd	Inslee
Brady (PA)	Israel
Brady (TX)	Issa
Braley (IA)	Jackson (IL)
Bright	Jackson Lee
Brown, Corrine	(TX)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson (GA)
Ginny	Johnson, E. B.
Burgess	Johnson, Sam
Burton (IN)	Kagen
Buyer	Kennedy
Campbell	Kildee
Cao	Kilroy
Capps	Kind
Capuano	King (NY)
Cardoza	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Carnahan	Kissell
Carson (IN)	Klein (FL)
Castle	Kline (MN)
Chandler	Kosmas
Childers	Kratovil
Chu	Langevin
Clarke	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Cole	LaTourette
Connolly (VA)	Levin
Conyers	Lewis (GA)
Cooper	Lipinski
Costa	Loeb sack
Courtney	Lofgren, Zoe
Crenshaw	Lowe
Crowley	Lujan
Cuellar	Lummis
Cummings	Lungren, Daniel
Dahlkemper	E.
Davis (CA)	Mack
Davis (TN)	Maffei
DeFazio	Maloney
DeLauro	Markey (CO)
Dent	Markey (MA)
Deutch	Matheson
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matsui
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)
Dicks	McDermott
Dingell	McGovern
Doggett	McHenry
Donnelly (IN)	McNerney
Doyle	Meek (FL)
Driehaus	Mica
Edwards (TX)	Mic haud
Ehlers	Miller (NC)
Emerson	Miller, George
Engel	Moore (KS)
Eshoo	Moran (VA)

Space	Watson
Stearns	Welch
Sullivan	
Terry	
Thompson (PA)	Barrett (SC)
Thornberry	Boucher
Tonko	Brown (SC)
Towns	Butterfield
Upton	Cantor
Velazquez	Castor (FL)
Watt	Clay
Weiner	Cleaver
Westmoreland	Cohen
Whitfield	Davis (AL)
Wilson (SC)	DeGette
Wolf	Delahunt
Woolsey	
Young (FL)	

Murphy (CT)	Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim	Myrick
Nadler (NY)	Napolitano
Norton	Nye
Oberstar	Obey
Olson	Oliver
Ortiz	Owens
Pallone	Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)	Payne
Pence	Perlmutter
Peters	Peterson
Pierluisi	Polis (CO)
Pomeroy	Price (NC)
Putnam	Rahall
Reichert	Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen	Ross
Rothman (NJ)	Ruppersberger
Rush	Ryan (OH)
Sablan	Salazar
Sanchez, Linda	T.
Sanchez, Loretta	Sarbanes
Schauer	Schiff
Schock	Schrader
Scott (VA)	Serrano
Sestak	Shea-Porter
Sherman	Sires
Skelton	Slaughter
Smith (WA)	Snyder
Spratt	Stark
Stupak	Sutton
Tanner	Taylor
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt	Tiberi
Tierney	Titus
Tongas	Turner
Van Hollen	Visclosky
Walden	Walz
Wasserman	Schultz

Watson	Wittman	Yarmuth
Welch	Wu	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—36

Faleomavaega	Mollohan
Fallin	Nunes
Filner	Paul
Granger	Pingree (ME)
Green, Gene	Reyes
Hinchey	Shuler
Hinojosa	Speier
Hodes	Teague
Hoekstra	Wamp
Linder	Waters
Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Melancon	Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1738

Ms. DELAULO changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. BLACKBURN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 235, I was away from the Capitol due to commitments in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 13, noes 386, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

AYES—13

Chaffetz	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Edwards (MD)	(TX)	Quigley
Grijalva	Kucinich	Towns
Gutierrez	Lee (CA)	Velazquez
Honda	Moore (WI)	

NOES—386

Ackerman	Bilbray	Brown, Corrine
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Akin	Bishop (NY)	Buchanan
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Altmire	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Andrews	Blumenauer	Buyer
Arcuri	Blunt	Calvert
Austria	Boccieri	Camp
Baca	Boehner	Campbell
Bachmann	Bonner	Cantor
Bachus	Bono Mack	Cao
Baird	Boozman	Capito
Baldwin	Bordallo	Capps
Barrow	Boren	Capuano
Bartlett	Boswell	Cardoza
Bartons (TX)	Boustany	Carnahan
Bean	Boyd	Carney
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Carson (IN)
Berkley	Brady (TX)	Carter
Berman	Braley (IA)	Cassidy
Berry	Bright	Castle
Biggart	Broun (GA)	Chandler

Childers
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hirono
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa

Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nye
Oberstar
Obey

Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney

Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—37

Barrett (SC)
Boucher
Brown (SC)
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Davis (AL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Filner

Gohmert
Granger
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Meeke (NY)
Melancon
Mollohan
Nunes

Paul
Pingree (ME)
Reyes
Rooney
Shuler
Speier
Teague
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Wilson (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1744

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 236, I was away from the Capitol due to commitments in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 301, noes 100, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

AYES—301

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Alexander
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Boccheri
Bono Mack

Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brady (IA)
Bright
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cao
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Castle

Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell

Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Flake
Foster
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski

LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McGovern
McIntyre
McMahon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morrison
Murray
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nye
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)

Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney

NOES—100

Akin
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Bilbray
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Broun (GA)
Brown, Corrine
Cantor
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Christensen
Chu
Clarke
Coffman (CO)
Conyers
Courtney
Cummings
Davis (IL)

DeLauro
Edwards (MD)
Ellison
Fattah
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foss
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gingrey (GA)
Gordon (TN)
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harper
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hirono
Honda

Hunter
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Jordan (OH)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kucinich
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Markey (MA)
McDermott

McHenry	Pitts	Slaughter
McKeon	Price (GA)	Souder
McMorris	Quigley	Sullivan
Rodgers	Rangel	Terry
Michaud	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Royce	Towns
Miller, Gary	Rush	Velázquez
Moore (WI)	Salazar	Watt
Moran (KS)	Schakowsky	Weiner
Myrick	Schmidt	Westmoreland
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Wittman
Oberstar	Skelton	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—35

Barrett (SC)	Filner	Nunes
Boucher	Gohmert	Paul
Brown (SC)	Granger	Pingree (ME)
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Reyes
Castor (FL)	Hinche	Shuler
Clay	Hinojosa	Speier
Cohen	Hodes	Teague
Davis (AL)	Hoekstra	Wamp
DeGette	Linder	Waters
Delahunt	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Faleomavaega	Melancon	Wilson (OH)
Fallin	Mollohan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1751

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 237, I was away from the Capitol due to commitments in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 11, noes 387, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 238]

AYES—11

Gutierrez	Kaptur	Moore (WI)
Honda	Kilpatrick (MI)	Towns
Jackson Lee	Kucinich	Velázquez
(TX)	Lee (CA)	Weiner

NOES—387

Ackerman	Berkley	Boren
Aderholt	Berman	Boswell
Adler (NJ)	Berry	Boustany
Alexander	Biggart	Boyd
Altmire	Bilbray	Brady (PA)
Andrews	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Arcuri	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Austria	Bishop (NY)	Bright
Baca	Bishop (UT)	Broun (GA)
Bachmann	Blackburn	Brown, Corrine
Bachus	Blumenauer	Brown-Waite,
Baird	Blunt	Ginny
Baldwin	Boccheri	Buchanan
Barrow	Boehner	Burgess
Bartlett	Bonner	Burton (IN)
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Buyer
Bean	Boozman	Calvert
Becerra	Bordallo	Camp

Campbell	Heller	Moore (KS)
Cantor	Hensarling	Moran (KS)
Cao	Herger	Moran (VA)
Capito	Herseth Sandlin	Murphy (CT)
Capps	Higgins	Murphy (NY)
Capuano	Hill	Murphy, Patrick
Cardoza	Himes	Murphy, Tim
Carney	Hirono	Myrick
Carson (IN)	Holden	Nadler (NY)
Carter	Holt	Napolitano
Cassidy	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Castle	Hunter	Neugebauer
Chaffetz	Inglis	Norton
Chandler	Inslee	Nye
Childers	Israel	Oberstar
Christensen	Issa	Obey
Chu	Jackson (IL)	Olson
Clarke	Jenkins	Olver
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Clyburn	Johnson (IL)	Owens
Coble	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, Sam	Pascarell
Cole	Jones	Pastor (AZ)
Conaway	Jordan (OH)	Paulsen
Connolly (VA)	Kagen	Payne
Conyers	Kanjorski	Pence
Cooper	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Costa	Kildee	Perriello
Costello	Kilroy	Peters
Courtney	Kind	Peterson
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Petri
Crowley	King (NY)	Pierluisi
Cuellar	Kingston	Pitts
Culberson	Kirk	Platts
Cummings	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Poe (TX)
Dahlkemper	Kissell	Polis (CO)
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy
Davis (IL)	Kline (MN)	Posey
Davis (KY)	Kosmas	Price (GA)
Davis (TN)	Kratovil	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Lamborn	Putnam
DeLauro	Lance	Quigley
Dent	Langevin	Radanovich
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Rahall
Diaz-Balart, L.	Larson (CT)	Rangel
Diaz-Balart, M.	Latham	Rehberg
Dicks	LaTourette	Reichert
Dingell	Latta	Richardson
Doggett	Lee (NY)	Rodriguez
Donnelly (IN)	Levin	Roe (TN)
Doyle	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)
Dreier	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Driehaus	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)
Duncan	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Edwards (MD)	Loebach	Rooney
Edwards (TX)	Lofgren, Zoe	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	Lowey	Roskam
Ellison	Lucas	Ross
Ellsworth	Luetkemeyer	Rothman (NJ)
Emerson	Lujan	Roybal-Allard
Engel	Lummis	Royce
Eshoo	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	E.	Rush
Farr	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Fattah	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Flake	Maffei	Sablan
Fleming	Maloney	Salazar
Forbes	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda
Fortenberry	Marchant	T.
Foster	Markey (CO)	Sanchez, Loretta
Fox	Markey (MA)	Sarbanes
Frank (MA)	Marshall	Scalise
Franks (AZ)	Matheson	Schakowsky
Frelinghuysen	Matsui	Schauer
Fudge	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff
Gallely	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt
Garamendi	McCaul	Schrader
Garrett (NJ)	McClintock	Schwartz
Gerlach	McCollum	Scott (GA)
Giffords	McCotter	Scott (VA)
Gingrey (GA)	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	McGovern	Serrano
Gonzalez	McHenry	Sessions
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Sestak
Gordon (TN)	McKeon	Shadegg
Graves	McMahon	Shea-Porter
Grayson	McMorris	Sherman
Griffith	Rodgers	Shimkus
Grijalva	McNerney	Shuster
Guithrie	Meek (FL)	Simpson
Hall (NY)	Mica	Sires
Hall (TX)	Michaud	Skelton
Halvorson	Miller (FL)	Slaughter
Hare	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Harman	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)
Harper	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Hastings (WA)	Minnick	Snyder
Heinrich	Mitchell	Souder

Space	Tiahrt	Watson
Spratt	Tiberi	Watt
Stark	Tierney	Welch
Stearns	Titus	Westmoreland
Stupak	Tonko	Whitfield
Sullivan	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)
Sutton	Turner	Wittman
Tanner	Upton	Wolf
Taylor	Van Hollen	Woolsey
Terry	Visclosky	Wu
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Yarmuth
Thompson (MS)	Walz	Young (AK)
Thompson (PA)	Wasserman	Young (FL)
Thornberry	Schultz	

NOT VOTING—38

Akin	Fallin	Nunes
Barrett (SC)	Filner	Paul
Boucher	Granger	Pingree (ME)
Brown (SC)	Green, Al	Reyes
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Schock
Carnahan	Hinche	Shuler
Castor (FL)	Hinojosa	Speier
Clay	Hodes	Teague
Cohen	Hoekstra	Wamp
Davis (AL)	Linder	Waters
DeGette	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Delahunt	Melancon	Wilson (OH)
Faleomavaega	Mollohan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1758

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 238, I was away from the Capitol due to commitments in my congressional district. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 285, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 239]

AYES—112

Altmire	DeLauro	Honda
Bartlett	Dreier	Inglis
Bilbray	Duncan	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Ellison	Jordan (OH)
Bonner	Ellsworth	Kaptur
Boozman	Flake	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boren	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Brady (TX)	Foster	Kingston
Bright	Fox	Kline (MN)
Broun (GA)	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Carter	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Christensen	Giffords	Latham
Clarke	Gingrey (GA)	Lee (CA)
Coble	Grijalva	Lee (NY)
Coffman (CO)	Gutierrez	Lowey
Cole	Hall (TX)	Marchant
Conaway	Hastings (WA)	Marshall
Cooper	Hensarling	Matheson
Costello	Herger	McMahon
Courtney	Herseth Sandlin	McMorris
Culberson	Himes	Rodgers

Michaud
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nye
Olson
Pence
Pitts
Platts

NOES—285

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
Boehner
Bono Mack
Bordallo
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)

Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Richardson
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sessions
Shadeeg
Sherman
Skelton

Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tonko
Towns
Velázquez
Watt
Weiner
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Napolitano
Norton
Oberstar
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Perlmutter
Perrillo
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pierluisi
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sablan
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schauer
Schiff
Bonner
Schmidt
Schock
Schwartz
Scott (GA)

Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stupak

Barrett (SC)
Boucher
Brown (SC)
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Clay
Cohen
Davis (AL)
DeGette
Delahunt
Faleomavaega
Fallin
Filner

NOT VOTING—39

Gohmert
Granger
Green, Gene
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Linder
McCauley
McCauley (NY)
Melancon
Mollohan
Nunes

Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Welch
Whitfield
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Holden
Honda
Hunter
Inglis
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (NY)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
Manzullo
Marchant

Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nye
Olson
Paulsen
Perrillo
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney

Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadeeg
Sherman
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Souder
Space
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velázquez
Watt
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

NOES—223

Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boccheri
Bono Mack
Bordallo
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson (IN)
Castle
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett

Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Drieaus
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fleming
Foster
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gonzalez
Gordon (TN)
Grayson
Green, Al
Hall (NY)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hirono
Holt
Hoyer
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)

Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Maffei
Maloney
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Napolitano
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pierluisi
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR
The CHAIR (during the vote). Mem-
bers have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1805

Mr. SPRATT changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:
Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 239,
I was away from the Capitol due to commit-
ments in my congressional district. Had I been
present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ
The CHAIR. The unfinished business
is the demand for a recorded vote on
the amendment offered by the gentle-
woman from New York (Ms.
VELÁZQUEZ) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been
demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 171, noes 223,
not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 240]

AYES—171

Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Altmire
Arcuri
Austria
Bachmann
Bachus
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boustany

Brady (TX)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buyer
Calvert
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)

DeLauro
Dreier
Duncan
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fattah
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Graves
Griffith

Clyburn
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett

Ross	Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)
Rothman (NJ)	Serrano	Tiaht
Ruppersberger	Sestak	Tierney
Ryan (OH)	Shea-Porter	Titus
Sablan	Sires	Tsongas
Salazar	Slaughter	Van Hollen
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (NE)	Visclosky
T.	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)	Walz
Sarbanes	Snyder	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Spratt	Schultz
Schauer	Stark	Watson
Schiff	Stupak	Welch
Schock	Sutton	Woolsey
Schrader	Taylor	Wu
Schwartz	Terry	Young (AK)
Scott (GA)	Thompson (CA)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—42

Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Melancon
Blackburn	Faleomavaega	Mollohan
Blumenauer	Fallin	Nunes
Boucher	Filner	Paul
Boyd	Gohmert	Pingree (ME)
Brown (SC)	Granger	Reyes
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Shuler
Castor (FL)	Hinchey	Speier
Christensen	Hinojosa	Teague
Clay	Hodes	Wamp
Cohen	Hoekstra	Waters
Culberson	Linder	Waxman
Davis (AL)	Mack	Wilson (OH)
DeGette	Meeks (NY)	Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1811

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall 240, I was away from the Capitol due to commitments in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SCHIFF, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2499) to provide for a federally sanctioned self-determination process for the people of Puerto Rico, pursuant to House Resolution 1305, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hastings of Washington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2499 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Amend Section 2(c)(3) to read as follows:

(3) Statehood: Puerto Rico should be admitted as a State of the Union, the official language of this State shall be English, and all its official business shall be conducted in English; and laws shall be in place that ensure that its residents have the Second Amendment right to own, possess, carry, use for lawful self defense, store, assembled at home, and transport for lawful purposes, firearms and in any amount ammunition, provided that such keeping and bearing of firearms and ammunition does not otherwise violate Federal law. If you agree, mark here

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers the bill on Puerto Rico's future, this motion to recommit provides Members of the House an opportunity to register their views on questions of English as an official language and on the importance of protecting Americans' Second Amendment rights.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, two amendments were filed with the Rules Committee to directly address the issues of the English language and Second Amendment gun rights. Both were blocked by the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee.

What that means, of course, is that Members have no opportunity to debate this issue. Making an amendment in order does not guarantee, obviously, the outcome. Yet we are even denied the opportunity of English as the official language and Second Amendment rights. So this motion to recommit simply combines these two issues in the motion to recommit. Let me explain specifically what the motion will do.

It will amend the description of "statehood," which will appear on the plebiscite ballot authorized under this bill, to state: one, English will be the official language of the State, and all official business will be conducted in English; two, laws will be in place that will "ensure residents have the Second Amendment right to own, possess, carry, use for self-defense, store assembled at home, and transport for lawful purposes, firearms and in any amount ammunition, providing that such keeping and bearing of firearms and ammunition does not otherwise violate Federal law."

This MTR simply expresses the views on these two important issues. It has been asserted during the debate that providing for English as the official language is something unprecedented or that it is something which hasn't been talked about or whatever. That is simply not true, because four States were admitted to the Union, and part of that admittance was a requirement that English would be the official language.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a pretty straightforward motion to recommit, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Puerto Rico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. The matters that are being raised in this motion are premature. They are irrelevant, actually, because all that H.R. 2499 does is to consult the people of Puerto Rico on the four available options that they have regarding our status—the current status of the territory, statehood, independence, and free association.

The people of Puerto Rico have not yet expressed by a majority that they want to join the Union as a State. I hope that it comes about, and when it comes about, Puerto Rico will comply with the Second Amendment in the same way that all the other States must comply with the Second Amendment.

The same goes for the English language. That shouldn't be an issue. It shouldn't be an issue now in Puerto Rico, and it will not be an issue, if the time comes, when we become a State. Puerto Rico now has two official languages—English and Spanish. Ninety percent of our parents want their children to be fluent in English. We are proud of having English as a language, and we want to improve it. In fact, I have two bills pending before this Congress for that very purpose.

So both issues are being unfairly placed—at least that is what the motion seeks—in the ballot that the people of Puerto Rico will be having in front of them. What the motion seeks is to somehow tell the people of Puerto Rico, You can have statehood, but just English only and only if you comply with the Second Amendment.

I oppose this motion because it is untimely, and it is premature. The day will come when we will debate these issues, but that day is not now.

I yield 1 minute to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may not yield blocks of time and must remain on his feet.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Puerto Rico has 2 minutes and 40 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to this motion.

I traveled throughout the Soviet Union to captive nations with many of you, and I rose in those nations and said to the leaders, You need to give your people self-determination.

Many of you have said the same thing on this floor. You've said it about tyrant governments that have kept their peoples from practicing their own religions, from speaking their own languages, from adopting their own laws. You have spoken out against it. They were foreign nations, and it was easy to do. But now we talk about Puerto Rico, a territory of the United States of America. What Mr. PIERLUISI seeks to do, what his Governor wants to do, what two-thirds of his legislature want to do—the senate and the house—is to give them the opportunity to exercise that self-determination.

Now, on this floor, we have adopted an amendment, for which many have spoken, that we ought to give four alternatives rather than three. We've done that. There will now be four alternatives for the people of Puerto Rico on the second ballot. Let us now defeat this amendment designed only to defeat this bill.

Hawaii was not made to do this. As the gentleman from Alaska, DON YOUNG, will tell you and as he said on the floor, Alaska was not made to do this, and we did not ask that to occur in any one of the captive nations to which we spoke. Ronald Reagan did not ask for that. Let us not ask for it. Let us give an honest up-or-down vote to the people of Puerto Rico, who for 112 years have perceived themselves as a colony.

Now, there are some who want statehood. There are some who want independence and sovereign status. There are some who want commonwealth. There are, perhaps, some who want a relationship with the United States somewhat like Australia has with Great Britain. As the gentleman from Puerto Rico said, do not diminish this principle, however, with the politics of the future. This will be debated when and if Puerto Rico asks for statehood.

Your Republican Governor asks for a vote for this bill and against this motion to recommit. I ask my party to do the same. Give Puerto Rico its chance today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 375.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 198, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]

AYES—194

Aderholt	Fox	Miller, Gary
Adler (NJ)	Franks (AZ)	Minnick
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Mitchell
Alexander	Gallegly	Moran (KS)
Altmire	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Tim
Arcuri	Gerlach	Myrick
Austria	Giffords	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Nye
Bachus	Gohmert	Olson
Barrow	Goodlatte	Owens
Bartlett	Graves	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Griffith	Pence
Biggart	Guthrie	Perriello
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Peterson
Bilirakis	Harper	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Blackburn	Heller	Platts
Blunt	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Boccheri	Herger	Posey
Boehner	Holden	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hunter	Putnam
Bono Mack	Inglis	Radanovich
Boozman	Issa	Rehberg
Boren	Jenkins	Reichert
Boustany	Johnson (IL)	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Bright	Jones	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Jordan (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Ginny	King (IA)	Rooney
Buchanan	King (NY)	Roskam
Burgess	Kingston	Royce
Burton (IN)	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Calvert	Lamborn	Schauer
Camp	Lance	Schmidt
Campbell	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	LaTourette	Sessions
Capito	Latta	Shadegg
Carney	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Carter	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Cassidy	Lipinski	Simpson
Castle	LoBiondo	Skelton
Chaffetz	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Childers	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Coffman (CO)	Lungren, Daniel	Souder
Cole	E.	Space
Conaway	Mack	Stearns
Costello	Manzullo	Sullivan
Crenshaw	Marchant	Terry
Culberson	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Davis (KY)	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dent	McCauley	Tiahrt
Donnelly (IN)	McClintock	Tiberi
Dreier	McCotter	Titus
Driehaus	McHenry	Turner
Duncan	McIntyre	Upton
Ehlers	McKeon	Walden
Ellsworth	McMahon	Westmoreland
Emerson	McMorris	Whitfield
Flake	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Fleming	McNerney	Wittman
Forbes	Mica	Wolf
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Foster	Miller (MI)	

NOES—198

Ackerman	Braley (IA)	Costa
Andrews	Brown, Corrine	Courtney
Baca	Cao	Crowley
Baird	Capps	Cuellar
Baldwin	Capuano	Cummings
Bean	Cardoza	Dahlkemper
Becerra	Carnahan	Davis (CA)
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Davis (IL)
Berman	Chu	Davis (TN)
Berry	Clarke	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Clyburn	Deutch
Blumenauer	Connolly (VA)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boswell	Conyers	Diaz-Balart, M.
Brady (PA)	Cooper	Dicks

Dingell	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Doggett	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	Rothman (NJ)
Edwards (MD)	Larson (CT)	Royal-Ballard
Edwards (TX)	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
Ellison	Levin	Rush
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Eshoo	Loebach	Salazar
Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda
Farr	Lowe	T.
Fattah	Lujan	Sanchez, Loretta
Frank (MA)	Lynch	Sarbanes
Fudge	Maffei	Schakowsky
Garamendi	Maloney	Schiff
Gonzalez	Markey (CO)	Schock
Gordon (TN)	Markey (MA)	Schrader
Grayson	Matheson	Schwartz
Green, Al	Matsui	Scott (GA)
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Gutierrez	McCollum	Serrano
Hall (NY)	McDermott	Sestak
Halvorson	McGovern	Shea-Porter
Hare	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Harman	Michaud	Sires
Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Slaughter
Heinrich	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Hereth Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Snyder
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Spratt
Hill	Moran (VA)	Stark
Himes	Murphy (CT)	Stupak
Hirono	Murphy (NY)	Sutton
Holt	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner
Honda	Nadler (NY)	Taylor
Hoyer	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Thompson (MS)
Israel	Oberstar	Tierney
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Tonko
Jackson Lee	Oliver	Towns
(TX)	Ortiz	Tsongas
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Van Hollen
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Velázquez
Kagen	Pastor (AZ)	Visclosky
Kaptur	Payne	Walz
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Wasserman
Kildee	Peters	Schultz
Kilroy	Polis (CO)	Watson
Kind	Pomeroy	Watt
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Price (NC)	Weiner
Kissell	Quigley	Welch
Klein (FL)	Rahall	Woolsey
Kosmas	Rangel	Wu
Kratovil	Richardson	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—38

Barrett (SC)	Filner	Paul
Boucher	Granger	Pingree (ME)
Boyd	Green, Gene	Reyes
Brown (SC)	Hinchey	Ross
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Shuler
Castor (FL)	Hodes	Speier
Chandler	Hoekstra	Teague
Clay	Kilpatrick (MI)	Wamp
Cohen	Linder	Waters
Davis (AL)	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
DeGette	Melancon	Wilson (OH)
Delahunt	Mollohan	Yarmuth
Fallin	Nunes	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1839

Mr. CANTOR changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 241, I was away from the Capitol due to commitments in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 169, answered “present” 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 242]

YEAS—223

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Napolitano
Adler (NJ)	Gordon (TN)	Neal (MA)
Andrews	Grayson	Oberstar
Arcuri	Green, Al	Obey
Baca	Grijalva	Oliver
Baird	Hall (NY)	Ortiz
Baldwin	Halvorson	Owens
Barrow	Hare	Pallone
Bartlett	Harman	Pascarell
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pastor (AZ)
Berkley	Heinrich	Payne
Berman	Hensarling	Pence
Biggert	Herseht Sandlin	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Peters
Bishop (NY)	Hill	Peterson
Blackburn	Himes	Polis (CO)
Blumenauer	Hirono	Pomeroy
Boccheri	Holt	Posey
Boswell	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brady (PA)	Inslee	Putnam
Braley (IA)	Israel	Rahall
Brown, Corrine	Issa	Rangel
Brown-Waite,	Jackson (IL)	Reichert
Ginny	Jackson Lee	Richardson
Buchanan	(TX)	Rodriguez
Burton (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman (NJ)
Campbell	Kagen	Roybal-Allard
Cantor	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cao	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Capps	Kildee	Salazar
Capuano	Kilroy	Sánchez, Linda
Cardoza	Kind	T.
Carnahan	King (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta
Carson (IN)	Kirk	Sarbanes
Castle	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Shakowsky
Chu	Kissell	Schauer
Clarke	Kline (MN)	Schiff
Cleaver	Kosmas	Schock
Clyburn	Kratovil	Schrader
Coffman (CO)	Langevin	Schwartz
Cole	Larsen (WA)	Scott (GA)
Connolly (VA)	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Costa	Levin	Sestak
Crenshaw	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Loeb sack	Sires
Cuellar	Lofgren, Zoe	Skelton
Cummings	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Dahlkemper	Luján	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Lungren, Daniel	Spratt
Davis (TN)	E.	Stark
DeFazio	Lynch	Stupak
Dent	Mack	Sutton
Deutch	Maffei	Tanner
Diaz-Balart, L.	Maloney	Taylor
Diaz-Balart, M.	Markey (CO)	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	Markey (MA)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson (PA)
Doggett	McCarthy (CA)	Tierney
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Titus
Driehaus	McCollum	Tonko
Edwards (MD)	McDermott	Towns
Edwards (TX)	McGovern	Tsongas
Ehlers	McNerney	Van Hollen
Ellsworth	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Engel	Mica	Walden
Eshoo	Michaud	Walz
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, George	Schultz
Fattah	Moore (KS)	Watson
Flake	Moran (VA)	Watt
Foster	Murphy (NY)	Welch
Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Patrick	Woolsey
Fudge	Murphy, Tim	Wu
Garamendi	Nadler (NY)	Young (AK)

NAYS—169

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Broun (GA)
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Alexander	Blunt	Calvert
Altmire	Boehner	Camp
Austria	Bonner	Capito
Bachmann	Bono Mack	Carney
Bachus	Boozman	Carter
Barton (TX)	Boren	Cassidy
Bean	Boustany	Chaffetz
Berry	Brady (TX)	Chandler
Bilbray	Bright	Childers

Coble	King (IA)	Price (GA)
Conaway	Kingston	Quigley
Cooper	Kucinich	Radanovich
Costello	Lamborn	Rehberg
Courtney	Lance	Roe (TN)
Culberson	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Davis (IL)	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
Davis (KY)	Latta	Rogers (MI)
DeLauro	Lee (NY)	Rohrabacher
Donnelly (IN)	Lewis (CA)	Rooney
Dreier	Lipinski	Roskam
Duncan	LoBiondo	Ross
Ellison	Lucas	Royce
Emerson	Luetkemeyer	Rush
Fleming	Lummis	Ryan (WI)
Forbes	Manzullo	Scalise
Fortenberry	Marchant	Schmidt
Fox	Marshall	Sensenbrenner
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Shadeegg
Gallely	McClintock	Sherman
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Shimkus
Gerlach	McHenry	Shuster
Giffords	McIntyre	Simpson
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Gohmert	McMahon	Smith (NJ)
Goodlatte	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Graves	Rodgers	Souder
Griffith	Miller (FL)	Space
Guthrie	Miller (MI)	Stearns
Gutierrez	Miller, Gary	Sullivan
Hall (TX)	Minnick	Terry
Harper	Mitchell	Thornberry
Hastings (WA)	Moore (WI)	Tiahrt
Heller	Moran (KS)	Tiberi
Herger	Murphy (CT)	Turner
Holden	Myrick	Upton
Honda	Neugebauer	Velázquez
Hunter	Nye	Weiner
Inglis	Olson	Westmoreland
Jenkins	Paulsen	Whitfield
Johnson (IL)	Perriello	Wilson (SC)
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Wittman
Jones	Pitts	Wolf
Jordan (OH)	Platts	Young (FL)
Kanjorski	Poe (TX)	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—37

Barrett (SC)	Granger	Paul
Boucher	Green, Gene	Pingree (ME)
Boyd	Hinchey	Reyes
Brown (SC)	Hinojosa	Shuler
Butterfield	Hodes	Speier
Castor (FL)	Hoekstra	Teague
Clay	Kilpatrick (MI)	Wamp
Cohen	Klein (FL)	Waters
Davis (AL)	Linder	Waxman
DeGette	Meeks (NY)	Wilson (OH)
Delahunt	Melancon	Yarmuth
Fallin	Mollohan	
Filner	Nunes	

□ 1855

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 242, final passage of H.R. 2499, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 242, I was away from the Capitol due to commitments in my Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes this evening. Had I been present, my votes would have been as follows:

“Nay” on Velázquez (NY) Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute; “yea” on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 2499; “yea” on H.R. 2499.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend to several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on the Motion to Recommit; “nay” on passage of H.R. 2499.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

VACATING ORDERING OF YEAS
AND NAYS ON HOUSE RESOLU-
TION 375, SUPPORTING THE
GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORK-
ERS’ MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the ordering of the yeas and nays on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 375 be vacated, to the end that the resolution be considered as adopted in the form considered by the House on Tuesday April 27, 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, for the purposes of announcing next week’s schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

I observe that our former colleague is on the floor, the Governor of Puerto Rico. Congratulations to him.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, we will consider H.R. 5019, the Home Star Energy Retrofit Act of 2010.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, I noticed that my friend the majority leader did not mention the budget or the supplemental for

Afghanistan and Iraq for next week's schedule. Obviously, both are extremely critical. I would like to ask, Madam Speaker, when does he expect those items to come to the floor?

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question, and I appreciate him yielding.

As I have said before on the floor with respect to scheduling, I agree with him on both items. I think the budget is very important, and clearly the supplemental is very important, and I hope to be able to move those as soon as possible.

□ 1900

We are working on both. I know the Appropriations Committee is working on the supplemental. I know Mr. SPRATT is working on budget. So I tell my friend that I share his view of their importance, and that we hope to be able to move those to the floor within the near future. I cannot give him a date, but within the near future.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just like to reiterate our concern that as he just expressed the need for us to focus on matters of fiscal importance—and a budget would reflect that—as well as, Madam Speaker, to ensure that the House goes in regular order, hopefully, with a supplemental bill. I know there were some reports that that supplemental would come directly to the floor. I can yield to the gentleman if he has anything to respond to that.

Mr. HOYER. I really don't have anything specific. I have talked to Mr. OBEY. I don't have the specifics of how he is going to consider that. Obviously, that is an appropriations matter, as the gentleman well observes. I would be glad to talk to Mr. OBEY specifically about how he is going to proceed and let the gentleman know.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, and I think in order to wrap up probably the shortest colloquy yet, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 3, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 4, 2010, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KOSMAS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infra-

structure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,

Washington, DC, April 29, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Today, on April 29, 2010, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met in open session to consider four resolutions for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, in accordance with 33 U.S.C. §542. The resolutions authorize Corps surveys (or studies) of water resources needs and possible solutions. The Committee adopted the resolutions by voice vote with a quorum present.

Enclosed are copies of the resolutions adopted by the Committee.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. OBERSTAR.

Enclosures.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2822—COASTAL CONNECTICUT STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, MILFORD, CONNECTICUT

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Land and Water Resources of the New England-New York Region, published as Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 1st Session, and other reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood damage reduction, coastal storm damage reduction, coastal erosion, and other related purposes in the vicinity of the estuaries and shoreline from the Housatonic River to the Oyster River of Milford, Connecticut.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2823—HOUSATONIC RIVER WATERSHED, MASSACHUSETTS AND CONNECTICUT

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Land and Water Resources of the New England-New York Region, published as Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 1st Session, and other reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and other related purposes in the vicinity of the Housatonic River, Connecticut.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2824—FAIRFIELD AND NEW HAVEN COUNTIES, CONNECTICUT

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Land and Water Resources of the New England-New York Region, published as Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 1st Session, and other reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood damage reduction, coastal storm damage reduction, coastal erosion, and other related purposes in the vicinity of the estuaries and shoreline of Fairfield and New Haven Counties, Connecticut.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2825—FIVE MILE RIVER, CONNECTICUT

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United

States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Land and Water Resources of the New England-New York Region, published as Senate Document No. 14, 85th Congress, 1st Session, and other reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood damage reduction, environmental restoration, and other related purposes in the vicinity of Five Mile River, Connecticut.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BRAZILIAN CRITTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. I want to bring to the attention of the House a serious problem that we have encountered. It seems as though we have such a problem on our borders that now, in southeast Texas, in a small port city called Port Arthur, three illegal Brazilians have shown up in the last couple of days. They have come into the port of Port Arthur and they were stowaways on this massive ship that was bringing in Brazilian paper pulp. Thirteen thousand tons of this pulp was brought in on this ship, and through inspection by Federal authorities, they found three stowaways—three illegals from the nation of Brazil.

Now, you probably assume that I'm talking about people, but I am not. Here is one of those stowaways, one that they actually captured and gave an identification number. You see, the three stowaways turned out to be three grasshoppers. Little bitty critters. Yet our United States Agriculture Department was able to investigate and find

these three little illegal stowaways in this massive amount of paper pulp from Brazil.

So they took the pulp, and it's sitting on the dock. It's going to be sprayed down for any disease. They even gave one of these grasshoppers an official government ID number. Here it is down here: 234735719. Of course, the grasshopper was found in Jefferson County, Texas. The other two, apparently, didn't look quite as bad as this one. They thought this one might be carrying some type of disease and it has, lo and behold, been brought to Washington, D.C., to be examined further by Federal authorities to see if it was carrying any type of disease or contamination from the nation of Brazil.

Madam Speaker, I bring this to the House's attention for this reason: our United States Department of Agriculture is so good and so intense and so competent that they are able to keep out of the United States illegal grasshoppers about three inches long. They're able to find them on this massive ship in the port of Port Arthur, Texas, carrying 13,000 tons of paper pulp. They're able to capture these grasshoppers, send one to Washington, D.C., to be examined to see if it's carrying disease. I commend the Department of Agriculture for their work and tenacious activity in making sure illegal Brazilians—that are grasshoppers—don't enter the United States without being caught.

Now it seems to me that if we are so advanced with technology and manpower and competence that we can capture illegal grasshoppers from Brazil in the holds of ships that are in a little small place in Port Arthur, Texas, on the Sabine River—the Sabine River, Madam Speaker, is the river that separates Texas from Louisiana—if we're able to do that as a country, how come we cannot capture the thousands of people that cross the border every day on the border of the United States? They're a little bigger than grasshoppers, and they should be able to be captured easier.

Well, maybe it's because the country doesn't have the moral will, the government doesn't have the moral will, to protect the borders from people coming in. But we sure have the moral will as a Nation to keep these grasshopper critters from coming into the United States from Brazil. Maybe we need to make the guy down there in southeast Texas that captured this grasshopper from Brazil, he ought to be in charge of homeland security. If he's able to do this with grasshoppers, just think what he can do on the southern border of the United States.

So, Madam Speaker, we have the technology; we have the capability. We need the moral will as a Nation to secure the border of the United States. That is the responsibility of the Federal Government. The Federal Government should take some lessons from the guy that captured this grasshopper

and make sure that the southern border of the United States is protected from people who come here without permission. We can do it. Let's have the moral will. Let's send the National Guard, if necessary, to the border to protect the dignity of the Nation. Because that's the job of the Federal Government.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HELP FOR THE BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that Mr. POE of Texas, my good friend who just spoke, he added a little bit of levity, but it was very important. The point that he was making, in that we have the ability in this country to really deal with things like agriculture and insects that might come in and contaminate our crops, but we have a serious, serious problems on the 1,980-mile border between us and Mexico.

The administration has cut some of the money from the whole project of putting fences and more broad Border Patrol agents on that border. And it's a war zone, as Mr. POE has said. Mr. POE is the leader in pointing out the problems with what's going on on the border between Texas and Mexico, as well as the border all the way between the United States and the whole country of Mexico.

So I'd just like to say if I were talking to the President or anybody in his administration, listen to Mr. POE and the guys who've been down there on the border. They know. The sheriffs and the police in Arizona and all of them know that this is a war zone. American lives are at risk. And we're not doing anything from the Federal level to deal with the problem.

As Mr. POE said in a letter that he wrote that I cosigned the other day, they need to send, if necessary, the National Guard down there to augment the Border Patrol agents, some of whom are at risk every single day, every single night. And so if I were talking to the administration on behalf of my good friend, Mr. POE, and all of us that are concerned about the border and the illegals that are coming in by

the thousands and now into the millions over the years, we really need to do something to protect that border. No more talking about it. Let's do it. Let's send the National Guard down there with the ability to do whatever is necessary when they're dealing with armed drug dealers or people coming across the border who may mean to do harm to American citizens.

If we give them that right and we put the National Guard down there with the ability to defend themselves against these people that are coming across the border, we can sew that thing up and we can stop the illegal immigration. Then, once we secure the border, we can start talking about a real, viable immigration reform bill. But until we secure the border, we shouldn't be talking about that. That's the number one objective.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POSEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORBES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CHRYSLER DEALERSHIPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I'd like to read a letter from a former Chrysler dealer in my district: "Dear Congressman, I'd like to thank you for cosponsoring H.R. 2743, the Automobile Dealers Economic Rights Restoration Act of 2009, and H.R. 3179, the Financial Services and Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

"The letter I received from you, dated August 7, 2009, was appreciated. The H.R. 3288 bill has no doubt done a great deal of good for a lot of GM and Chrysler dealers. However, the bill did not address the dealerships that lost everything and has no possible way of going back into business.

"When Chrysler informed me on May 14, 2009, that my franchise was going to be terminated effective at the close of business on June 9, 2009, I had 263 new Chrysler vehicles in inventory and \$412,000 of Chrysler parts. In their letter they stated: 'We intend to maintain business as usual and after rejection, we want to work with you to assist in the redistribution of new vehicles and parts to ease the burden on you.'

"They did nothing except lie to Congress. Chrysler went out of their way to make sure I could not stay in business. The week of May 18, they sent

letters to all my customers informing them that I could not be a Chrysler dealer as of June 10, 2009, and if they need service work to take their vehicles to another dealership. At the time I was terminated, my dealership was in the top 5 percent of sales; my customer satisfaction was one of the highest Chrysler had. In 2006, my parts and service managers both were awarded Chrysler Managers of the Year and I was runner-up for Dealer of the Year.

"I could not believe I was being terminated. When I tried to call and inquire as to why I was terminated, no one would answer my call. To this day, no one has explained why I lost my franchise. By the close of business on June 9, the dealership had sold all but 186 vehicles at retail and reduced the parts inventory to \$352,000. When I called Chrysler about what I should do with the leftover new vehicles, I was told that they had other issues to deal with and would get back to me in a few months. They also stated that I could not retain the vehicles as new, and the vehicles would not qualify for any of the factory rebates or factory warranties.

□ 1915

"I was forced to sell all of the 186 vehicles to other Chrysler dealers at \$3,000 to \$4,000 loss per vehicle, which amounted to a loss of \$700,000 of cash. When I tried to sell my Chrysler parts to other dealers, they received phone calls and were told if they need parts to call Chrysler, not Dave Croft Motors."

Madam Speaker, this is just the first page of three that I am submitting for the RECORD which talks about, really, the theft of personal-property in the government bailouts of automobile companies. This is an individual family business that has existed for decades that was destroyed, abused, and left with nothing.

He ends with, "I will keep telling my story to anyone who will listen. I hope that some kind of law will be put in place so this cannot happen to another business in the future. I still have to tell myself that I live in America and not in China."

What he experienced was the government intervention and taking over of personal, private wealth in this country. And it's an indication of a sad direction this country has taken when it thwarts the capitalist model of raising capital, taking a risk, and either benefiting from that risk or losing everything.

When we get involved in bailing out Wall Street banks, and then we don't bail out small Main Street businesses, what we have here is a discrepancy. If we would allow the market to work, it's not compassionate. It's very, very tough, but it is the best way to turn around the economy. Otherwise, small businesses around this country will continue to get rolled over by Big Business and Big Government.

And with that, I would like to submit the entire letter for the RECORD.

DAVE CROFT,

Edwardsville, IL, April 5, 2010.

Congressman JOHN M. SHIMKUS,
Regency Centre,
Collinsville, IL.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like to thank you for cosponsoring H.R. 2743 "The Automobile Dealers Economic Rights Restoration Act of 2009" and H.R. 3179, "The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for FY 2010." The letter I received from you dated August 7, 2009, was appreciated. The H.R. 3288 bill has no doubt done a great deal of good for a lot of the GM and Chrysler dealers. However, the bill did not address the dealerships that lost everything and has no possible way of going back in business.

When Chrysler informed me on May 14th, 2009 that my franchise was going to be terminated effective at the close of business on June 9th, 2009, I had 263 new Chrysler vehicles in inventory and \$412,000 of Chrysler parts. In their letter they stated "We intend to maintain 'business as usual' and 'After rejection, we want to work with you to assist in the redistribution of new vehicles and parts to ease the burden on you'". They did nothing except lie to Congress. Chrysler went out of their way to make sure I could not stay in business. The week of May 18th they sent letters to all my customers informing them that I would not be a Chrysler dealer as of 6/10/2009 and if they need service work to take their vehicles to Cassens & Sons in Edwardsville.

At the time I was terminated my dealership was in the top 5% of sales, my customer satisfaction was one of the highest Chrysler had. In 2006 my Parts & Service managers both were awarded Chrysler's managers of the year and I was runner-up for dealer of the year. I could not believe I was being terminated. When I tried to call to inquire as to why I was terminated, no one would answer my call. To this day no one has explained why I lost my franchise!!

By the close of business on June 9th, the dealership had sold all but 186 vehicles at retail and reduced the parts inventory to \$352,000. When I called Chrysler about what I should do with the left over new vehicles, I was told they had other issues to deal with and would get back to me in a few months. They also stated that I could not retail the vehicles as new and the vehicles would not qualify for any of the factory rebates or factory warranty. I was forced to sell all of the 186 vehicles to other Chrysler dealers at \$3,000 to \$4,000 lost per vehicle which amounted to a loss of \$700,000 dollars of cash. When I tried to sell my Chrysler parts to other dealers, they received phone calls and were told if they need parts to call Chrysler, not Dave Croft Motors.

In 2006 the dealership did \$47,251,683 in sales and employed 55 families. In 2007 we had \$55,894,301 in sales and employed 53 families. Just think of the tax dollars the State of Illinois, County of Madison and the City of Collinsville was collecting from my dealership!

After wholesaling my new car inventory to other Chrysler dealers and selling most of the parts for 15% on the dollar, it was the end of July and the dealership was out of cash. I did everything I could to keep the dealership open but without a franchise it was impossible to pay the overhead. I had to let most of my employees go. On January 19th, 2010 I had to file Chapter 7 bankruptcy. I was forced, to sell the building, which I built in 1979, to pay my creditors. My family and I lost everything we worked for the last 34 years.

It is still hard for me to believe that this could happen in America. I was always under the belief that my Congress would make sure

that nothing like this could ever happen to anyone who worked as hard as my family did. I could understand if Chrysler file bankruptcy and did not receive my tax dollars to keep them in business, and then my government gave 15% to Fiat who put no money into the deal—we the people are going to lose billions of dollars on Chrysler! I just look at Chrysler's sales! Anyone can see that the government will have to give them more money. Crazy!!

After Congress passed the Automobile Dealers Economic Rights Restoration Act, 400 of the 798 dealers filed for arbitration, I being one. Chrysler reviewed the 400 who had requested arbitration and decided that 50 of the terminated dealers should NOT have been terminated and gave them a letter of intent (gave them back their franchise) without going through the arbitration process, I am one of the 50 dealers. After losing my building, all of my parts, all of my equipment, have no cash and they tell me sorry you should not have been terminated—give me a break, and, oh yes, Chrysler gave all my customers to other dealers. What do I do now? I was making a profit when my dealership was terminated and believe I would still be a strong dealer today if Chrysler had not terminated my franchise. This has been a nightmare for my customers.

I know that when you cosponsored the above bill that you had great intentions. You have to know that Chrysler will not deal in good faith. They will make the requirements to get reinstated so unreal that very few dealers will be able to meet their requirements. What about dealers like myself who cannot go back into business? It does nothing for me. At one time NADA was trying to get compensation paid to the dealers that lost their franchise: \$3000 dollars for each unit retailed in one of the following years, 2006, 2007 or 2008, and purchase back all the Chrysler parts and special tools. This would only be a fraction of what my family has lost, but we have nothing now. Starting over at the age of 65 will be very hard and I will have a hard time putting any trust in the laws of our country.

I will keep telling my story to anyone who will listen. I hope that some kind of law will be put in place so this cannot happen to another business in the future. I still have to tell myself that I live in America and not in China.

DAVE CROFT.

WE NEED TO PASS COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I will be joined throughout the course of this evening by some of my colleagues, including the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and others who might join us. We want to speak tonight about a topic that's been in the news lately and is incredibly important to the American people, and that's the topic of immigration, securing our borders, immigration reform. A lot of us were, frankly, shocked at some of the steps that Arizona took a couple of weeks ago which has sent a powerful message to us here in Washington that we need to act.

It's not up to States to patrol their borders, to protect who is here, and to enforce workplace laws; it is the responsibility of the Federal Government. The Federal Government has failed to enforce our immigration laws. It's time to act now to pass comprehensive immigration reform. I have heard the message from Arizona loud and clear, and I hope that that passage of that bill provides an impetus for us to take the politically challenging but critical steps necessary to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Today was an exciting day for immigration reform. In the Senate, they introduced their conceptual proposal for immigration reform. This was introduced today by a number of Senators. Now, it's not a bill. We have a bill in the House that I proudly joined as a cosponsor of with about 100 Members to fix our broken immigration system. But this is the first step towards a bill in the Senate, which I hope will be introduced soon and will be bipartisan. It starts out 1(a), "securing the border first before any action can be taken to change the status of people in the United States illegally." As long as we have a porous border and we are failing to secure our border, there won't be any meaningful reform in our own country. There will continue to be people who enter our country extralegally.

It's absolutely ridiculous that in this day and age, a sovereign Nation, the greatest Nation on Earth, cannot secure our own border. It's also critical that we know who's here. The Senate plan and the House plan that I am a cosponsor of require our undocumented population to register and undergo a background check. That's an important step, because right now we don't even know who is here in our own country. That's a security threat that every American should take seriously, and I think it's critical that we know who's here.

Arizona has triggered a national crisis and underlined the critical need for action at the Federal level. This ridiculous measure that Arizona passed—and I should point out that we should expect, if Congress continues to fail to take action, other States to pass some misguided and extreme State laws. But this Arizona law has triggered a moral crisis by forcing American citizens, families who are American citizens, to live in fear.

What does this law mean? It means that as American citizens are going about their business, going to school, going to the 7-Eleven, whatever they're doing, and if an officer thinks, thinks, suspects that they might be an illegal immigrant—could it be the clothes they wear? Could it be their race? Could it be an accent they speak with?—that officer can then demand proof, proof of their legal status in the U.S.

Now, I ask you, who carries the proof of their American citizenship with them? I know I don't when I go out shopping. I know I don't when I go for

a walk. So these Americans will be detained. They could spend days, weeks, even months away from their families as they have to prove their American citizenship and request the documentation to do so. That can frequently take a long time, and I have been to these immigrant detention facilities. We have one in Aurora, Colorado. That is the type of facility that an American citizen will be taken to simply because they are not walking around or going about with the documentation of their American citizenship.

This threatens to turn Arizona into a police state. It threatens to strike fear in the hearts of hundreds of thousands of Arizonans, particularly Arizonans of particular ethnic heritages. That's why I feel very strongly this bill is a racist bill, one born of xenophobia, but one that will affect the rights of American citizens. Will it lead to the apprehension of more undocumented immigrants? It might. It will, on the margins. But it will lead to the detention of American citizens accidentally because American citizens, as we go about our own business in our own country, should not have to carry with us proof of our citizenship in this great Nation.

Where does this overreach of government end? This new law has triggered a political crisis in Arizona, effectively causing the law enforcement community, which has strongly opposed this bill in Arizona, to face the choice of going after people based on their race or protecting people from crime.

The fastest growing segment of our electorate will continue to pay attention to this issue. Latinos want to know that we have an interest in fixing the broken immigration system and making sure that no other States overreach and go after American citizens like Arizona does.

And yet we can all understand—me from Colorado, others across the Nation—why Arizona felt it had to fail to them to take action on this issue. It's because the Federal Government has failed to act on comprehensive immigration reform. Immigration is a national issue that requires a national solution. It can't be solved on a State-by-State basis. We need the Federal Government to take bold and decisive action, and we need to pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

We stand with the Arizona Association of Police Chiefs, the Yuma County sheriff, Mesa police chief and other law enforcement officials who are opposed to Senate bill 1070 in Arizona because it makes Arizonan communities less safe and threatens American citizens with detention. If people are afraid that their families and neighbors and friends will be rounded up by police, they live in constant fear of a government and a police that are there to serve and protect.

The Arizona immigration enforcement law is an example of the chaos that's been created by the Federal Government's failure to protect our bor-

ders and act on comprehensive immigration reform. The new Arizona law is an attack on our American values. President Obama's acknowledged that Arizona's law undermines the basic notions of fairness that we cherish as Americans. This is a challenge of who we are as a Nation, who we are as human beings, and whether we're going to stand up for American ideals or reject those to appeal to our worst instincts and the worst among us.

Let's do the right thing and fix our broken immigration system. That is a challenge to us here in Congress, and it shouldn't take courage from Members of Congress to talk about, support, and pass immigration reform. Quite to the contrary, it should take courage to avoid passing immigration reform, because the American people overwhelmingly want immigration reform, and those Members of Congress who stand in the way of securing our borders and ensuring that only people can work legally risk not returning next year and having a different voice that demands the action of the United States Congress.

This is one of the few issues that has broad agreement among my constituents in Colorado. I have said this to a number of audiences. When we talked about health care, there were many of my constituents who supported health care reforms and many who opposed it. With regard to immigration, I have not found one constituent on the left or the right that believes that we are doing everything right with regard to immigration. It is broken. Conservatives agree it's broken. Liberals agree it's broken. Nobody believes our immigration system works perfectly.

We have an undocumented population of over 10 million people. We have thousands, hundreds of thousands of businesses across this country that violate the law every day. The rule of law across our great Nation has been challenged and undermined. But we in Congress—I hope that we in Congress have heard the cry from Arizona, the cry from the 49 other States, the cry from the American people demanding that we in Congress take action to fix our broken immigration system and may restore the rule of law to this great Nation.

I see I am joined by my friend from Minnesota, who I will yield to.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Congressman KEITH ELLISON here from the State of Minnesota, and it is very timely that we are here to talk about immigration. The fact of the matter is that it is a symptom of the Congress' failure to pass comprehensive immigration reform that we get these draconian pieces of legislation such as were signed into law in Arizona on April 23, 2010, just a few days ago. If the United States Government would take hold of this immigration debate and pass comprehensive immigration reform, States would not have to resort

to these extreme measures—unconstitutional in my view—that Arizona has taken.

Let me just point out a few things. The law says that police officers can stop and detain people who are suspected of being illegal aliens and demand that they provide proof that they are U.S. citizens. The fact of the matter is that this—some people have said, Well, you know, KEITH, this could make people who may have a brown complexion and dark hair, who sort of have a typical Mexican appearance, that might subject them to unfair and illegal stops. My response is, That's true. It may stop Latinos, but it will stop anybody, because there's no certain way that a Latino person looks. There is a wide diversity all throughout the community, a wide diversity, no color, no language, no culture. People look all kinds of ways. The most Anglo-looking person in Arizona could be stopped and demanded to show their proof of citizenship, and if they don't have it, they could be carted off.

The fact is that I am making this argument because I don't want Americans of any background to think that they are going to be somehow safe from a law as sweeping and unfair as this one. No one is safe when the Constitution is offended in such a dramatic way as it has been by this Arizona law. But at the same time I have no sympathy for this Arizona law, I will say that it is a symptom of the Congress' failure to deal with comprehensive immigration reform.

I want to say that the argument has been made that somehow this is about addressing issues of crime and law enforcement. You know, if that were true, why would the Arizona Association of Chiefs of Police oppose a law for fiscal and public safety reasons, noting that the fear of government officials would diminish the public's willingness to cooperate with the police in criminal investigations, and it will negatively affect the ability of law enforcement agencies across the State to fulfill their many responsibilities in a timely manner?

The fact is that law enforcement officials who know something about law enforcement don't like this law. They are right. And the fact is this law is offensive to our Constitution. But again, it calls into question what we are doing here in Congress on comprehensive immigration reform, which is nothing much. The fact is we need to get busy on immigration reform. The American people want it. It is popular. It is something that the American people have asked for, and the Congress should step forward and do something about it right away.

So let me yield back to the gentleman from the great State of Colorado and just point out that comprehensive immigration reform is something that I believe we need.

There are just a few principles that I want to mention before I yield back, and that is that the progressive immi-

gration reform agenda passed by the Progressive Caucus believes in keeping families together, creating a path towards citizenship and employment verification. Because as much as we talk about securing the border—and we should secure the border—you can't always secure the border at the border. We need the cooperation of all employers to make sure that they are doing employment verification so that we can make sure that the border is being secured. So yes, at the border, but also at the point of employment which people are drawn to.

There is more to be said about this, but I yield back to the gentleman.

□ 1930

Mr. POLIS. I appreciate Mr. ELLISON bringing up employer verification. One of the key components of the Senate outline requires biometric employment verification. So this is not a Social Security number that could be used by somebody who is 6 foot 1 and 52 one day and someone who is 5 foot 3 and 42 the next day. This is a real biometric ID. No later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this proposal, the Social Security Administration will issue biometric Social Security cards that will be fraud resistant, tamper resistant, wear resistant, be machine readable, contain a photograph and an electronically coded microchip processor which possesses a unique biometric identifier for the authorized card bearer. It could be a fingerprint, eye scan.

We are going to be serious about knowing who can work and who is not legally employable. We need to be serious about making sure that it is the right person that we are talking about.

Again, there are hundreds of thousands, if not millions of violations of this area of employment law every day in this country, and we are not even remotely serious about cracking down on those. That is why we urgently need, why Arizona and the rest of the country has called on Congress to address this issue and why we only ignore them at our own peril.

We are joined by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) who, in her time here, has already become a champion of comprehensive immigration reform and making sure that we can fix our broken immigration system. I am glad to welcome Congresswoman CHU from California.

Ms. CHU. Today I stand here to say our immigration system is broken and fixing it is critically important to the long term security and prosperity of our Nation. Of course, I have a much different opinion on how to fix it than some on the other side of the aisle. Where they see an attack on American culture and way of life, I see a chance to strengthen our Nation with a new generation of productive and active citizens. Where they see fear and paranoia, I see an opportunity to do the right thing, the humane thing, and bring 12 million immigrants out of the shadows and into society.

What they don't see is the ongoing family separations, the exploitation of workers by unscrupulous workers, and the true human cost of our broken immigration system.

I get calls every day in my district from families who have sacrificed and worked hard to put food on the table and send their children to school. Take the case of Maria, an American citizen, who came into our district office last month with her two children, ages 2 and 4, crying torrents of tears. They were trying to do the right thing. Her husband was undocumented. She had gone to Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, with her husband for an appointment with an immigration official where she was petitioning for her husband to receive legal status. The immigration officer denied it saying there was insufficient hardship.

It is now more than a year since her husband was left stranded in Ciudad Juarez. Even married to an American citizen, he is barred from reentering the country for up to 10 years because of a law passed by Congress in the 1990s making it tougher for undocumented immigrants to acquire legal status through marriage. In the meantime, Maria has lost her house, was forced to do a short sale because she could not keep up with the mortgage payments without her husband's income. Her children wake up in the middle of the night crying for their daddy. To me that sounds like sufficient hardship.

These family separations are cruel and counterproductive to both legal immigrants and citizens. It is families that have historically helped immigrants assimilate into American life and helped prevent health and social problems. Family networks give individuals the support and resources they need to become successful, productive members of our society.

And if Congress doesn't act to fix our immigration system, States will do their own thing and we will be stuck with an unfair and impractical patchwork system. Just last week, the State of Arizona passed the broadest and strictest immigration measure in generations in any State. The law makes a failure to carry immigration documents a crime, and gives the police broad power to detain anyone suspected of being in the country illegally.

Now I don't walk around with my birth certificate or passport, which is expensive and out of financial reach of many. And neither does Abdon, a commercial truck driver living in Arizona. Last week on the heels of the Governor signing this new law, he was shackled by the police and detained by the Phoenix Immigration and Customs Enforcement Office. Abdon was born a citizen of the United States. He has a job. He pays taxes. He speaks English. His wife Jackie is a natural-born citizen of the United States. She too has a job and she also speaks English. She pays taxes. But he was pulled over and arrested. Why? Not because he was speeding, that's for sure.

When the officer demanded his papers, Abdon could only produce his driver's license and Social Security number. Not good enough. At a routine commercial weigh station on a regular workday, Abdon made the mistake of not carrying his birth certificate with him. That's right, his birth certificate.

Now why did the police really pull him over? It is apparently now the law of the State of Arizona you can arrest people, citizen or not, simply for appearing Hispanic.

This is a sadly familiar story, but one that was thought to be safely in the past. In the years following the Civil War, States began to implement a series of discriminatory laws designed to control former slaves and free blacks. Under the vagrancy laws, police could stop anyone anywhere and require you to show proof of employment on demand. If you didn't, you could be arrested and your labor sold to the highest bidder.

But what if you forgot to carry your employment records with you when you left the house that morning, what if you, like so many regular citizens, were unaware of the anti-vagrancy laws? What if you were simply unemployed? Well, it might be your last mistake as a free citizen of the United States.

Sound familiar? Well, it does to Abdon, and it is for Abdon and the thousands of other Arizonians that we need immigration reform this year. We cannot solve our immigration woes by simply creating new problems. Instead, we must pass a comprehensive bill that actually fixes our immigration system that penalizes employers who would hire undocumented workers and exploit their status for their own gain. We need a bill that protects the family and repairs a bureaucratic system that forces citizens and immigrants to live apart from their loved ones. We need a bill that secures our borders and provides a clear path to citizenship and employment for otherwise law-abiding immigrants, undocumented or not.

America would not be the great Nation it is without the passion, ingenuity and perseverance of the millions of immigrants who have come to our shores looking for a better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Congresswoman CHU, for your leadership on this issue. Those are very powerful words that you shared. The stories that you shared, those individuals are not alone. There are hundreds of thousands of people across our country every day who have powerful stories about what has happened to them through our immigration system.

Let me briefly mention something that the Congresswoman alluded to about detention. It could be an American citizen or somebody who is undocumented and taken to detention, that means that taxpayers are paying their way. Taxpayers are paying \$120 a day on average in these detention facilities. So if this Arizona law leads to

more undocumented people being apprehended, then we are putting them up for free at a government hotel. So rather than working and not being a burden on American society, Arizona's new law forces taxpayers to put up illegal immigrants, feed and clothe and house them at taxpayer expense.

I bet if the people of Arizona knew that, they would have second thoughts about this law. But that is exactly what will happen. Not only that, there will be American citizens who are swept up in this. You go out for coffee, run your errands, don't bring your proof of citizenship with you, boom, you're in a detention facility. American taxpayers are paying \$120 a night for you, and it might take a week, a month, however long it takes until you can get your documentation. God forbid you are visiting from Alaska, visiting from Florida, were born to a midwife and don't have a hospital birth certificate, you could be in that detention facility even though you are an American citizen for months, all at taxpayer expense.

I think the solution that the American people want is a lot better than that. I don't think that the American people want to put up illegal immigrants in hotels for months or years at a time. I think the American people want to make sure that we don't have an undocumented population in this country. That is exactly what the House conference of immigration reform bill would do, as well as the Senate proposal that was outlined. The Senate bill would require that anybody who is here has to register and have a background check and they would get a prospective immigrant status, a transitional, temporary status to be here.

And eventually if they learned English, went through all of these steps, they could become a permanent resident. But that is quite a long way down the road. And to ever achieve lawful permanent residence, they would have to speak English, have basic citizenship skills, updated terrorism, criminal history and background checks, pay all Federal income taxes, fees and civil penalties and register for selective service after 8 years on the temporary status.

No, the American people don't want to put illegal immigrants up in hotels like the Arizona legislature are proposing. The American people don't want to have a large undocumented population.

I would also like to point out the problems that this law has interposed on one of our Nation's most important strategic relationships, and that is our relationship with our neighbors to the south, Mexico. I am the founder here in the Congress of the U.S.-Mexico Friendship Caucus to facilitate one of our most important trading partners. The flow of ideas and goods between the U.S. and Mexico is an important part of the prosperity we have here, and the growing economy in helping Mexico meet the demands of its grow-

ing middle class. And yet this law is hurting our bilateral relationship with Mexico.

You know, before I got to Congress, I occasionally used to travel internationally. I had been to places like Tunisia and Egypt and Australia. And on our Department of State, there is a site where they list any country with a warning. Don't go to this country because it has a civil war or it has terrorists. My mother wouldn't have liked it very much if our own Department of State said you might die if you go there.

Well, you know what, Mexico is now advising their citizens, their tourists, not to go to Arizona. Yes, one of our very own States is being warned against visiting by a country that sends many tourists to our Nation.

I represent some of the ski resorts, Vail, Beaver Creek and Copper Mountain in Colorado. We have tens of thousands from Mexico every year. It is one of our larger countries that sends tourists that keep Americans employed and spend money in Colorado. But by criminalizing a whole status of people, any Mexican tourist would have second thoughts about going to Arizona. And it saddens me as an American, having looked at these warnings that our Department of State has and always seeing Third World developing countries, saying glad I don't live where that civil war or dictator is, well, now one of our closest and most important friends and neighbors, the great country of Mexico, has listed one of our States on their warnings.

That's a blow to the American pride. I am proud to be an American, and to think that our country has some of these problems that only developing countries or dictatorships or police states have had in the past is not only disgraceful, but it will undermine the economy of Arizona. Tourism will dry up.

And it won't be just Mexico and Arizona. I have a feeling that many other countries will follow suit from East Asia and Latin America because who wants their citizens to be apprehended and placed in detention for months at a time. And that would be a very reasonable response. I hope that this law in Arizona is tossed out as soon as possible.

Again, it is important for us to understand why Arizona passed it. It was a message, a message to us in Congress that Congress has failed the American people. Congress has failed to enforce our borders and implement real employment enforcement, real security. Indeed, Congress' lack of action is leading to the undermining of American sovereignty not only in Arizona, but in many States, including my home State of Colorado, that has hundreds of thousands of people who live extra-legally—we don't know who they are, we don't know where they are—work, in most cases, extra-legally because Federal enforcement has been a joke.

□ 1945

This is a solution that we can solve. It's not a solution that should involve posturing from the left or the right. It's one that the American people and the people of Arizona, very rightfully so, have demanded action on with a shot across our bow.

I hope the people of Arizona don't suffer too much under this law because I understand and sympathize with their goals. I hope it's overturned soon. Certainly, if it's allowed to continue, it will hurt their economy, they will lose jobs, Arizonans will lose work, and Americans will be forced into detention at taxpayer expense. I hope that that doesn't happen. I hope this law is overturned before that happens. But the shot across the bow has been received, and I hope that it provides the urgent impetus for those of us here in Congress to move forward now on comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentleman from Colorado for really raising these issues.

The fact is, I do just want to say that the Progressive Caucus has some essential principles that we believe are essential to have in any immigration bill. We know that a version was dropped in the Senate; there was another dropped in the House earlier.

What we say is we think that we've got to keep families together. We have to create a path to earn citizenship. This isn't handing out citizenship to anybody. People have to take care of the business that the gentleman from Colorado already mentioned—paying all taxes, going through courses in English and citizenship, making sure that they do everything that they have to do, but at least they're allowed to be on a path that will lead them to citizenship and that there would be employment verification.

But there are other important values that I think we should talk about as well. The fact is that one of those values is respect, another value is identifying the fact that young people studying hard every single day, graduating from an American high school, brought to this country by their parents, in my view, should be able to go to a college in their State and pay in-state tuition. So that's another value I think is very important. It enhances education, values and achievement, and it indicates that young people who have lived their lives here and grown up here and who came here through no fault or through no choice of their own can have a future.

The fact is that there are some basic principles that I think we should pursue. The thing that does concern me, though, is that sometimes we hear people, Madam Speaker, say things like, well, you know, this bill is dead on arrival, or that bill is not going to go anywhere; they just declare bills to be not in motion sometimes.

But I believe, Madam Speaker, that whether comprehensive immigration

reform moves or not is up to the people of America if they demand that it move. The same way that health care reform moved because people wouldn't let it die, immigration reform can move because the people are demanding it. The same way financial reform is moving, immigration can move because if people say we've got to have this, we need it, no more of our fellow neighbors living in the shadows, we need to have a legitimate path towards citizenship—it's not amnesty—that does involve real accountability, but at the same time allows people to come out of the shadows and have some status that they can have so that they can do what they need to do for themselves and their families. The fact is that this is the decent thing to do, it's the right thing to do.

By the way, I will point out, Madam Speaker, that there is a growing and strengthening coalition for immigration reform. In my own State of Minnesota, we used to have immigrant groups, people who are directly affected by immigration policy from new American groups, whether they're Latino or east African or Southeast Asian, or whatever community, a lot of times they would be at the forefront of this question of immigration reform.

But then we began to see labor come into the conversation. Labor does not want an exploitable, abusable group of people who are in the shadows that can undercut their wage rate. They want everybody aboveboard and walking through the front door to have a status so that they can organize them so that they can have some stability. Even the chamber of commerce in my city has said, look, we're for comprehensive immigration reform as well. I'm not speaking for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, but I can tell you that there are many local chambers of commerce around this country who know that immigration reform is the right policy.

So the fact is we have a growing coalition; we have a coalition that's coming together, that's deepening and coming together to demand this. So I guess my message, Madam Speaker, is to say, never say that we can't get comprehensive immigration in 2010; it can happen with a strong will and with a committed champion, and with people who demand it of their leaders who are charged with the responsibility of representing them in Congress.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. The people of this country are tired of this problem being used for political purposes from the left and the right. The American people just want to see this issue solved. The American people are smart; they recognize that the longer we delay taking action the bigger the problem gets.

Our immigration laws should reflect our interests as Americans and our values as Americans; but we need to treat this as something to solve, not an opportunity for politicians to score points on the left or points on the right by preying on our legitimate or illegitimate

concerns or prejudices. Yes, we truly are a Nation of laws, but we are also a Nation of immigrants. We need to make sure that immigrants obey our laws, learn English, and pay their taxes; and then we welcome them as our American brothers and sisters.

It's amazing to see some of the non-conventional alliances, some of the groups that have been pushing for immigration reform. Among the strongest has been the faith-based community. Now, while I have many people who have supported me in the past who are of the Catholic faith, the archbishop, Archbishop Chaput in Denver, is somebody who I don't agree with on a lot of social issues; he and I disagree on many issues, such as a woman's right to choose, but on this issue, he and I joined together in an event in Denver in support of immigration reform that 1,500 people, on a Sunday after mass, packed into a church in strong, universal support for comprehensive immigration reform across the faith-based community. From the evangelicals to the Catholics to the Jews to the Muslims to the humanists and the atheists, there is strong support for comprehensive immigration reform.

There is also support—and this is very unusual in the context of politics—from both the organized labor community and unions and businesses in the chamber of commerce. Among the strongest advocates for immigration reform have been high-tech businesses, chambers of commerce, arm and arm with their workers, their unions. It's very rare to see that happen here in Congress. And yet, why hasn't Congress achieved anything? It seems like politicians on both sides of the aisle have preferred to keep this issue out there. Is it to rally their base? Is it to talk about the undocumented, about why they need more time to do something? And yet both sides have refused to take action. And it will take both sides working together to solve this issue with an American solution.

Obey our laws, learn English, pay taxes, and welcome to America—that has always been our message. And it needs to continue to be the underlying values with which we construct an immigration system that works, restores the rule of law to our Nation, and is an opportunity for us in Congress to rise to the challenge that the people of Arizona have put before us, that frustrated voters in cities and States across the country have put to us. And if Congress doesn't act to pass comprehensive immigration reform and solve this issue, I believe that the American people will elect a Congress that will.

I will yield to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I just want to go back to an important point that the gentleman from Colorado made just a moment ago. Congressman POLIS, Madam Speaker, made the point that people are in detention for months and

months as they await their immigration proceedings and the decision. These are not people who have robbed or hurt anyone or sold dope or anything like that. These are folks who are awaiting a decision in their immigration case. They are not criminals; they're awaiting immigration proceedings, decisions. These folks, these people in immigrant detention are just languishing, rotting.

There have been, since 2003, 107 people who have died in custody because they were in detention. If they were out, could they have gotten the medical attention that they needed? I'm sure in many cases they could have. The fact is that these are folks who are not serving criminal sentences. They haven't been convicted of hurting anyone or stealing people's property or doing anything wrong. They're just awaiting proceedings.

In fact, Madam Speaker, I was at an eighth grade graduation only a few days ago; and my daughter, who I was so proud of, was there with her friends and they were all abuzz—you know how kids that age can be. And I talked to another adult who I had known for a number of years because my older children went to school with her children and one of her children was in my daughter's class. And she said to me, you know, I want you to know it's good to see you. I was in detention. I recently got out of immigration detention. This is what this lady said to me. And it shocked me because my son, who is now 22 years old, was buddies with her son, who is now 22 years old, but they were running around my house when they were both seven and eight and nine years old and now here she is—I haven't seen her in a while—and she just told me that she had been there herself. I didn't even ask her how she got out—I was glad she was out—but the fact is that she had been in ICE detention herself. This is a woman who is a bright lady, smart, capable, raising children on her own, doing the best she can, happens to find her roots in Mexico. I didn't ask her about the details of her life, but I was concerned that she found herself in that awful situation.

I connected her with my office to do everything we could for her; but the fact is there is a human toll being taken on people every single day, people around us, people we know, people we don't even know what they're going through, but they have their own immigration nightmare that they're struggling through every single day.

Her children, I know the younger ones were born in the United States and I know the older ones came here at a very early age, they're my kids' close friends. But the fact is that it kind of struck me right across the face like a cold bucket of water that here is this lady who I know. I couldn't exactly call her a friend, but I can say that this is a person who I know, who I respect, and who was living her own private nightmare with regard to immigration.

It seems to me that the rules ought to be clearer, they ought to be fairer,

they ought to be predictable. It seems to me that the children who come here at an early age ought to be able to pursue their education in an institution in their State and not have to pay exorbitant out-of-state tuition just to do that. It seems to me that we ought to try to unite families. As Americans, we value families, and we ought to do something about that.

The fact is that people in immigrant detention, these folks are often some of the most abused folks in our community, Madam Speaker. I will just refer again to what the Congressman from Colorado mentioned a moment ago, detention, people are there for months, but these folks, some of them have been through tremendous ordeals; some are torture victims, some are victims of trafficking, some are from other vulnerable groups and are detained for months and even years, further aggravating their isolation, depression, and sometimes mental health problems.

The fact is that this situation is not right. These people are not criminals. They should not be held this way. And they're held at our expense—we're the ones who fork it over—but it's no picnic for them either. The fact is that we have to do something about it.

Over 30,000 people are held in immigrant detention on any given day at an average cost of more than \$100, \$120 per day. This has resulted in over 380,000 people held in detention in fiscal year 2009. Think about it: that's an incredible expense that we are paying because our immigration system has not been corrected, has not been addressed, and the fact is that we have to do something about it.

Since 2005, ICE has increased the number of detention beds by 78 percent. Taxpayers are paying the price of DHS's skyrocketing use of immigration detention, and DHS spends about \$1.7 billion on ICE custody operations.

□ 2000

So the fact is that a human toll is being taken. The broken immigration system offends our sense of fairness, and it offends our sense of being a humanitarian country. We've got to do something about it right away.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you.

I am glad that my friend from Minnesota brought up the important issue of detention. The Department of Homeland Security and ICE had 380,000 people in 2009 who were detained at taxpayer expense. One of the things we fear with the Arizona law is that these could actually be American citizens out working one day.

Oh, you don't have your papers. You're in detention. It could take a week. It could take a month.

There are many Americans who might have difficulty furnishing those records. Again, I point in particular to

those who were born of a midwife or who are very elderly or whose birth hospitals have been subject to fires or to disasters, where records are unable to be located or where they've been lost or where it simply has been human error. Each of these 380,000 people who were detained last year were detained at taxpayer expense. Now, I would argue that that is not good for them and that it's not good for us, the taxpayers.

First of all, as my colleague from Minnesota mentioned, 107 died, in many cases, due to medical treatment being withheld, due to abuses. In the incarceration system, in many cases, they are put in with actual criminals who have been convicted of crimes. Again, these are people who are not serving criminal sentences. They are being detained while awaiting decisions on their immigration proceedings. They might either then be released into our country or expelled through a different country, but despite that, they are held in prisons and jails, and they're often mixed with the general prison population, putting them at risk for their lives and limbs, all at taxpayer expense.

To the extent that it allows for the apprehension of more people, the Arizona law will simply result in the greater taxpayer expense of putting people up at the tune of \$120 a day. You know, that's what it costs. When I looked at it, I said, Gosh. We can put them up at Motel 6 for a quarter of that cost. Yet we continue, the taxpayers across our country, because of our complete failure to protect our borders and to have real immigration policy that works for our Nation. Over 300,000 people were incarcerated at taxpayer expense last year.

Comprehensive immigration reform is an American solution. It's common sense. It's fair. It's balanced. It has overwhelming support from the American people. Eighty-one percent agree that comprehensive reform is a balanced approach and that it's fair to taxpayers.

Voters across the board, from liberal to conservative, believe it is unrealistic to simply try to deport our way out of this problem. Seven in 10 voters agree that, in addition to increased enforcement and securing the border, illegal immigrants should be required to register and to meet conditions for permanent status. A comprehensive approach to immigration reform secures our borders, cracks down on employers who hire illegally, makes sure that we have real verification of who is able to work, and requires that illegal immigrants pay taxes and learn English to be eligible for permanent status. Voters should know that comprehensive immigration reform is an orderly process and that it will turn what has been completely uncontrolled and chaotic into a controlled flow of immigrants that continue to build our Nation and to reestablish the rule of law across our great Nation.

Americans are tired of the posturing on the left and the right. They are tired of the lack of solutions coming from Washington. They don't want to hear us complain about this, complain about that, hyperbole on this, hyperbole on that. What the people of Arizona have very clearly said they want and what the people of our country have very clearly said they want is for us here in Congress, the only place that this problem can be fixed, to fix this problem.

Border security is a joke. Enforcement of our laws at the workplace is a joke. We have over 10 million people violating the law in our country every day. The rule of law—our sovereignty—has been undermined. Taxpayers are putting up hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals a year at the cost of over \$100 a day. Why not put them up at cheap hotels and save three-quarters of that? I don't know, but this is what we're doing.

Does this make sense to anybody, Madam Speaker? The answer is no.

I have brought this up at almost all of my town hall meetings in Colorado, and I have yet to find a single constituent—and I have a lot of diversity among my constituents. They range from the Tea Party patriots on the right to the socialists on the left and everything in between. Not one of them is happy with the immigration system in this country. Not one of them is happy that we are putting up 300,000 people a year at the cost of \$120 a day. Not one of them is happy that we have an undocumented population of 10 million working illegally in this country. Not one of them is happy. Yet, to this point, Congress has failed to hear and to act upon that.

I believe that we will continue to fail at our own peril and that it is incumbent upon this Congress, with the fiercest urgency that the American people have placed on this issue before us, to solve this issue. We are a Nation of laws, and we are also a Nation of immigrants. That's why we need to make sure that our laws, our immigration laws, reflect our interests as Americans in order to create jobs for Americans, to provide safety and security for Americans and to help American businesses grow and succeed, which is why immigration reform is supported by chambers of commerce, by business interests as well as by unions, by faith-based communities, and by law enforcement.

We here in Congress should not be afraid of talking about solving the immigration issue. We should be afraid of not talking about solving the immigration issue. Every day that goes by without bills being moved forward or with bills being dropped or without solutions being discussed is a day that the American people will hold their Members of Congress accountable for not doing anything to solve this pressing national issue.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I was just in my district about a week ago at

a little church called Sagrado Corazon de Jesus. It's right there in south Minneapolis where a lot of folks gathered from the faith community. They were Catholic; they were Protestant; they were Jewish; they were Christian; they were Muslim; they were Hindu; they were of the Hmong spiritual tradition; and they were of no faith at all. Yet they came together to make an appeal to the American people for comprehensive immigration reform.

I think it's important to understand that the faith community has done a tremendous job in making sure this issue is at the forefront. The faith community has done such a great job because the faith community understands one essential thing, which is that all human beings are endowed with an inherent dignity which we, as fellow human beings, must respect if we are going to be in accordance with that faith tradition.

I want to thank them for their advocacy, and I want to let them know that I respect and appreciate their work.

Because I would like to see our anchor tonight be able to take the last 5 minutes to wrap it all up, let me also just mention in our waning minutes of our presentation that, as I've been sitting here, I've been checking my Twitter account, and I know that some people are happy that we're talking about comprehensive immigration and that some people are not.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say, to those folks who are happy about it, keep on working hard. We can do this thing. To the folks who aren't happy about this discussion topic tonight, I just want to say, Madam Speaker, that I know people are not happy with the current system. The status quo isn't working. Madam Speaker, people can say that they don't like this part of a bill or that part of a bill, but can we get together as Americans and discuss what we are going to do? Because the fact is that simply saying "no" is not an option.

I'll also submit to you that we are not going to get 12 to 20 million people on a bus and send them back home. That's not realistic. Many people who emigrate here without proper documentation don't even cross a border. They come in on airplanes. These are folks whose visas have run out and things like that. So just thinking that this is an "other side of the border" issue is missing much of the complexity that is going on here.

You're also not going to incarcerate 12 to 20 million people. You know, Madam Speaker, I had somebody say the crimes that the undocumented immigrants are committing are, one, being here and, the other, taking jobs from Americans. Let me just say, if you think what they're doing is a crime, Madam Speaker, what you're saying is that we're going to have to have 12 million to 20 million more jail cells to put people in. That's not practical.

We need a solution that makes sense, that is a pathway toward citizenship.

We need a solution which does involve border security but which also involves employer verification so that people will not think that they can emigrate to the United States without proper documentation and just find jobs. That's one of the things that attracts folks.

I will say one more thing, which is not in the progressive principles but which, I think, we do need to talk about. We need to talk about how poverty in other parts of the world, particularly in our own hemisphere, attracts people to the United States. Therefore, we should take a real look at our policies—at our trade policies, at our ag policies—and see if we are actually incentivizing people to come to the United States.

If we dump cheap corn into Latin America, what happens to the corn farmer in Latin America? I think we need to ask that question.

It needs to be part of the conversation, because I can't imagine most people who are undocumented really want to leave their homes, their languages, their families, or their friends in order to come to a country they don't know, where they don't necessarily speak the language and where they don't necessarily know anyone just to try to make lives. They probably would rather stay home, but there is something that is drawing them here, and it probably has something to do with the great economy of the United States. It probably also has something to do with trade and agriculture policies, which have put a lot of pressure on economies in this hemisphere.

So, with that, Madam Speaker, I am going to yield back to Congressman POLIS for the closing. He has really been a champion on this issue, and he has really kept the fire burning on it. I think, Madam Speaker, that we all owe him a debt of gratitude, along with other champions like LUIS GUTIERREZ and many, many others.

So I yield back to the gentleman, and I thank him for his work.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

With due respect, it is really the American people who have kept the fire under this issue. The American people do not want Congress to continue to ignore our broken immigration system.

What would ignoring immigration do? What if we just said we're not going to deal with it, you know, that there's too much to work on? We've got, you know, health care. We've got energy. Why bother doing immigration?

You know what? Failure to act on immigration reform will mean that we will likely have twice as many illegal immigrants in 10 years than we have now—twice as many. Instead of 10 or 12 million, we could be talking about 20 or 25 million. The longer we wait, the bigger the problem gets.

The goal of immigration reform needs to be to eliminate—to bring to

zero—illegal immigration. If immigrants who have been living in our country illegally want to become tax-paying American citizens, they need to pass a background check, pay extra taxes, work towards citizenship, learn English, register.

We need immigration reform that is both principled and pragmatic. We in this country have the right to decide who lives in our country and who doesn't, but we haven't been exercising that right. We've been allowing millions of people to live here without knowing who they are or what they are doing. Yet we continue to refuse to take action, and we do so at our own peril.

Yes, we should hear very clearly from Arizona and from other States that they are demanding action of the Federal Government. There is no good solution for a county or a State. I sympathize with our cities, our counties, and our States which are dealing with the failure of a Federal policy to protect our borders—Federal policies that undermine the rule of law and our national sovereignty, but it falls to the United States Congress to act to fix our broken immigration laws. People should not be able to cross the borders or to overstay their visas without permission, and businesses should not be able to exploit cheap labor off the books, undermining jobs for American citizens.

We in Congress have a unique opportunity now to take action. The American people are tired of excuses. They are tired of demagoguery. They want a solution that works and that ensures that we will have zero illegal immigrants in a year and in 10 years and in 20 years rather than seeing an increase from 10 or 12 million to 20 million or to 25 million or to 30 million.

What does "national sovereignty" mean if you don't even know who is within your borders or what they're doing or whether they're criminals? Why are we putting over 300,000 of them up at expensive hotels at over \$100 a day at taxpayer expense? Is that part of the solution?

□ 2015

It doesn't sound like part of the solution that the people of Arizona want. It doesn't sound like part of the solution that the American people want. Obey our laws, learn English, pay taxes, and welcome to America. We need to replace a broken system with one that works.

I call upon my colleagues in this Chamber and in the United States Senate on both sides of the aisle to stop playing political games with an issue that the American people are crying out for a solution on and to act and bring forward a real solution along the lines of the proposal that was introduced in the Senate today, along the lines of the House comprehensive immigration reform bill to demand that Congress move towards fixing this problem, restoring security to our bor-

ders, sovereignty to our Nation, preventing the undermining of the rule of law that this Nation was built upon, and strengthening our economy and providing jobs for American families.

Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues join me in moving forward immediately on comprehensive immigration reform to fix our broken laws and replace it with a system that works and is enforced.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to be recognized by you to address the floor tonight.

I am standing here trying to decide whether I want to support or rebut the statements from the gentleman from Colorado. I support a good number of the statements that he has made, and I may well try to rebut some of the other statements that he has made.

But the statement "replace a broken system with one that works," it's an interesting comment. I think it's clear that our immigration system is not working. Well, let me say that the system doesn't work, but I am not certain that the laws are incorrect. And that's the point that I would make is that I roll back to 1986 when Ronald Reagan was straight-up honest and failed me when he signed the amnesty bill of 1986. And the intent was that about a million people would be granted a path to citizenship and that would be it, it would be the end, and there would never be another immigration bill ever as long as any of us lived, and we would preserve the rule of law, and we'd learn to respect the rule of law, but we would allow for the million or so that were here illegally to have their path to citizenship in order to put this away, package it up, and be able to move on.

Well, it wasn't 1 million. It was closer to 3 million people, and there was fraud and there was corruption and there were counterfeit documents that were used that was part of that tripling. We might not have counted it right. It might have been more than a million. It might have been 1½ million. It was unlikely to be 2 million. But it turned out to be 3 million because people were gaming the system.

In my particular office, I took applications in and I made sure they filled out their I-9 forms, and I took copies of their documents and made sure my files were complete and considered their applications because I was sure that INS would be into my office to go through my books and make sure that I followed the law because it was going to be enforced by this newly robust Federal Government. That was the commitment. Amnesty now, enforcement forever, never amnesty again.

That was 1986. And here we are all these years later, 24 years later, and we have had by each succeeding administration—I'm not particularly happy with the enforcement we saw in the Reagan administration, and I was less happy with the enforcement that I saw in Bush 41 and less happy with what I saw under Bill Clinton and less happy with what I saw under George W. Bush, and I'm less happy with what I've seen under President Obama. Less and less effective enforcement.

And they do find a way to put together the data so that they can point to their enforcement and allege that in this particular administration, the enforcement against employers appears to be marginally stronger than it was under George Bush, but the enforcement against illegal workers is significantly less than it was under George Bush, and I wasn't happy with what George Bush did.

So is the system broken? I think the enforcement of the system is broken, Madam Speaker. I think that we have had a succession of Presidents who didn't demonstrate the will to enforce our immigration law, and because of that, there has been a growing disrespect for our immigration law. And even people that respect the law have seen that their competition who would hire illegals have a comparative advantage against them if they are going to adhere to the intent of the law. So the competition pushes other employers to violate the intent and the rule of law sometimes and hire the illegals to give them that comparative advantage against their competition. And slowly the respect for the rule of law and their adherence and compliance with the law has been diminished in this country to the point where I have people in my neighborhood that will say, Well, if you don't think I should hire an illegal, then who is going to fix my leaky roof? Who's going to paint my house? Who's going to do these other things?

That's not my job, Madam Speaker. My job is to stand up for the rule of law. And, yes, if I think there are laws that are unjust, then I should join with my colleagues and we should find a way to change them.

I don't happen to believe that our immigration laws today are unjust. I believe they are unenforced. And I think they are founded on good and just rule of law foundation.

Not having the documents in front of me, but I will reach into it a little bit. I've seen some documents that illustrated the laws that Mexico has with regard to their immigration laws, which are if ours are considered Draconian, theirs, in fact, are Draconian. And President Calderon has been arguing against Arizona law while he is enforcing more Draconian laws in the nation of Mexico against people who would come into their southern border. Crossing the border illegally is a felony, punishable up to 2 years in the penitentiary. That's one of the examples that we have.

So I would, Madam Speaker, just remind the American people that we have grounded these laws in just and rational cause. And now Arizona has seen that the Federal Government has been unwilling to enforce the laws, and they are watching a crime rate that, if you look at the data over the last 10 years, has increased in almost every category over the last 10 years. In order to be objective, not probably to the extent that has been articulated by many of the pundits, but it has been a gradual and significant increase in the crime rates in Arizona in the areas of murder and rape, violent crime, and certainly about the only thing, except illegal border crossings, which have diminished marginally over the last couple of years.

And a year ago last August, there was a report that there were as many as 1½ million that have been in the United States illegally that reversed their travels and voluntarily deported themselves back to Mexico and points south. Most of that is attributable to the decline in the economy rather than the increase in enforcement.

But it doesn't mean that there has been a diminishment of illegal drugs coming across the border or a diminishment in illegal activity along the border. In fact, those numbers are up. The violence numbers are up. The illegal drugs are up. The contraband crossing the borders are up. And the numbers of just individual illegal people by interdiction data that's delivered to us by Janet Napolitano, the Secretary of Homeland Security, are marginally down.

Now, it may or may not be that there are more illegal border crossings. It might well be that they are just simply interdicting fewer coming across the border and there is less enforcement. Although I do believe that there are marginally fewer illegal border crossings but more illegal drugs, more violence, more kidnappings. The State of Arizona has the highest kidnap rate in the Nation. In fact, some of the cities there have the highest or second highest kidnap rate in the world. That's because of the drugs and it's because of the cartels that are doing business in that area.

So Arizona passed a law, and this law does a number of things. It sets up a situation where law enforcement—it requires all of the political subdivisions in Arizona, the counties, the cities, the other political subdivisions, and the State, to enforce Federal immigration law. It sets it up so that an individual has standing to sue the political subdivision, local government, if they fail to enforce immigration law. And it provides for reasonable suspicion for a law enforcement officer to pick up an individual that's out in public if they reasonably suspect that that individual is unlawfully present in the United States. Those are good things, and they are all that I have described within the parameters of existing Federal law today.

The argument that has been made and the demonstrations that are queued up for May 1, and that will be this coming Saturday, they are trying to establish demonstrations all over America of people rising up to demonstrate against Arizona's immigration law. Well, look at what has happened. The Federal Government hasn't enforced immigration law.

I would say that our immigration laws are true and just and right altogether. And our problem is not because our laws are wrong. Our problem is not because we need to replace broken laws. It's that we need to take this system that—"broken" is not the right word for it, I would say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS). I think instead it's a system that is not being utilized because we lack the will to enforce immigration law in the United States. And that will has been diminishing over the years. The greater the number of illegals, the more people get to know their neighbors that may be in the United States illegally. They don't see that when you contribute to or allow or tolerate people who are unlawfully present in the United States in your neighborhood, when you hire them, you're contributing to the problem. People don't see that.

They just understand that we're all God's children. They like the people that came in. They see that they work hard, and so, therefore, they become their advocates. It's a natural thing to happen. But at the same time, while our laws are being broken and our laws are being disrespected, there's an undermining of the American system.

There's a reason that the people want to come to the United States. There isn't a country in the world where there aren't significant numbers of people that don't want to become Americans. And the reasons for that fall into a lot of categories, but one of them is we have respect for the rule of law. Our traditions honor the rule of law. Lady Justice is blind. When you think of the image of Lady Justice standing there blindfolded with the scales of justice balanced, without consideration for race, creed, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, or disability. That's the American creed.

We have equal justice for all, and justice is blind with regard to those characteristics. So people want to come here. They want to come to the United States from countries, countries that do not have that tradition of honoring the rule of law. They want to come to the United States from countries that have a corrupt tradition where you have to pay to play and it's who you know and how you pay them off or you curl up and you try to avoid the scrutiny of government and interactivity with the government agencies.

Here in this country, we're straight up, open, and honest, and, for the most part, moral and ethical, and we respect the law. But if we grant amnesty to 12 or 20 or more million people because

it's described as an insurmountable problem, that the argument that's often made that we can't deport 12 or 20 million people, in fact, we could. We could do that. It's not logistically impossible to do so.

I went over to London a little over a year ago to deal with the immigration issue over there. And I listened to them talk about the numbers of illegals that they have, and I have forgotten the exact number, but let's just say that we are in that 12 to 20 million category, and population ratio-wise, they are down in that 1½ million category, perhaps, of illegals in England. And what is their argument? You can't deport 1½ million people. It's too many. It's an impossible thing logistically.

Well, interestingly we're here with 12 to 20 million. We're making the same argument. Well, then, how many could we deport? If it's not 20 million and it's not 12 million and the British say they can't deport 1½ million, could we deport 1½ million if we chose to do that, or is it 1 million or ½ million or 100,000 or 10,000 or one? What is our capability logistically to deport people that are in the United States illegally?

And I will suggest that it's in direct proportion to our resources and our will to enforce the law. Our problem is not that we can't do so logistically. Our problem is we lack the will to do so from a moral standard because we're listening to both sides of this argument. The argument that people are here, that they just want to work. They want to earn for their families. And for the most part, that's true. And we disregard the argument that is this point that I need to make, Madam Speaker, and that is that 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in the United States of America come from or through Mexico, 90 percent. It's a consistent number that comes from the Drug Enforcement Agency, and it's been consistent throughout several years.

□ 2030

And the illegal drug distribution chains in America, magically, and this is a Drug Enforcement Agency response, magically if every one of the people that are in the United States illegally, magically tomorrow morning woke up in their home country where they were legal to live and reside, if that happened by magic wand overnight, there is at least one link in every illegal drug distribution chain in America that would be severed because at least one link has an illegal alien that's part of that drug distribution chain.

And so if it was in our endeavor to shut off the illegal drug distribution in America, we would simply make sure we enforced our immigration laws. And that would be a very temporary fix, and it might only last for hours or days, not much longer than weeks and perhaps not months, but it would sever the distribution of all illegal drugs in America, however temporarily that might be.

So when we look at what happens when we have 12 to 20 or more million illegals in America, what are the effects on our society? First, they are delivering 90 percent of the drugs from or through Mexico. And some of them at least touch the delivery of every illegal drug that's delivered in the United States of America while that's going on.

What is accompanied by the illegal drug trade? Violence, murder, theft, rape, all of those things that go along with crime are wrapped up and associated with the illegal drug distribution. And the people that are illegally distributing drugs that are in the United States illegally are also, however inadvertently, the channel of their work is enabled by, and not always willfully, and sometimes even unknowingly, it's enabled by the illegal community in the United States. It becomes an underground railroad for illegal people and illegal drugs that are pouring through, from and through Mexico into the United States. And it is something that brings about a high amount of death and destruction and diminishment of human capital, human resources, and human potential. That's why we outlaw those illegal drugs in the first place.

It doesn't mean that all the people that are involved in that are willfully evil or willfully trying to undermine our society. It might be inadvertent. But they are part of the problem. And if we are to have the rule of law, we have to enforce the rule of law. And to imagine that when law enforcement comes in contact with people who are here illegally that we would be unwilling to put them back into the condition that they were in at the time they broke the law is unconscionable for a rule-of-law Nation to think such a thing.

Think in terms of this: if someone walks into the bank and robs the bank and would walk out of that bank with all of the loot, and we would interdict them with our law enforcement and decide, well, you really only want to provide for your family, so we are going to let you go on here because we don't have the will to stop you at this point. Or our immigration laws, simply deporting people is the equivalent of putting them back in the condition they were in before they broke the law. It's the equivalent of taking a bank robber and saying you don't get to keep the money, but we are going to take you out of the bank and set you outside the door and let you go. That's the equivalent of deportation.

It is we put people back in the condition they were in before they broke the law. It's like taking a bank robber out of the bank, not letting them keep the loot, and you set them outside the door and say, okay, go. You are free to go. It's as if you never broke our law. That's what deportation is. It is not Draconian. It is not harsh. It is not cruel and unusual punishment. It is de minimis that we can do if we are going

to enforce the law. And if we are not willing to put people back in the condition they were in before they broke our immigration law, then we cannot have enforcement of our immigration law whatsoever.

It doesn't work to set a standard of amnesty that's been advocated by President Bush, President Obama, by many of the leaders over here on the left side of the aisle that we should give people a path to citizenship, make them pay a fine, force them to learn English. That seems a little odd to me, how you force somebody to learn a language and require them to pay their back taxes. Those are the minimum standards for somebody who would come into the United States legally in the first place.

If you want to become an American citizen, get in line. Get in line in a foreign country. Don't jump the line. Don't jump the border. And when you do that, and you go take your citizenship test—first, you have to pass the test that asks the question what's the economic system of the United States of America? And the answer is free enterprise capitalism. That's a little heads up there, Madam Speaker, on that one.

But when people come into the United States legally, they are required to learn English. If they want to become a citizen, if they want to go through the naturalization process, they are required to learn English. They are required to demonstrate proficiency in English in both the written and the spoken word. They have to understand our history and understand those principles that made America great. And we are not going to naturalize somebody that didn't pay their back taxes.

And the idea of a fine for being in the United States illegally, and that's the only other condition that we would add, whether that would be pay a fee of \$1,500—I remember when it started out to be \$500. And then \$500 seemed like a pittance, so they raised it to \$1,000 and then \$1,500. And under the Bush administration we had the discussion and the argument that their position was, well, it's not amnesty if they have to pay a fine. Oh, really? If the fine is cheaper than what you have to pay a coyote to sneak into the United States is it really a fine? And does the fine replace the penalty that exists for violating Federal law? And I say no.

If you grant people the objective of their crime, it's amnesty. To grant amnesty is to pardon people for the violation of the law and grant them the objective of their crime. That's what amnesty is. And so if we are going to have amnesty, let's be honest about it, Madam Speaker. Let's ask the people in this Congress, the President of the United States, the executive branch of government, and the people in the United States Senate that are now crafting up legislation are you for or against amnesty. If they want to support amnesty, it's fine with me if they

will just admit that. And then we can have a debate as to what degree of amnesty they are going to advocate.

But it's offensive to the American people to hear United States Senators or Members of the House of Representatives, Congressmen and -women, or the President of the United States, or his spokesmen or -women, argue that amnesty isn't amnesty when we know very well what amnesty is. Pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crimes. That's amnesty.

President Reagan understood it. He admitted amnesty was amnesty. He signed the amnesty bill in 1986. Yes, he let me down, but he was honest about it. And we haven't been honest during the second half of the Bush administration, and we certainly aren't honest during the Obama administration, this first third or so of the Obama administration about amnesty or immigration.

And so here are my concerns, that 90 percent of the illegal drugs that are consumed in the United States come from or through Mexico. Of all the violence that pours forth from that, it costs American lives dozens and dozens, in fact by the hundreds, every year Americans that die at the hands of illegals that are here in the United States of America illegally. That's the definition. And if we would be effective in enforcing immigration law, those people who died at the hands who are here illegally would still be alive.

When the school bus wrecked in southwest Minnesota and we lost four or five young girls there because it was caused by an accident by an individual who had two or three times been interdicted by law enforcement in the United States but was turned loose again, those girls would be young women today. They would be alive today. And their parents know that. It happens over and over hundreds of times. In fact, it's happened thousands of times since we failed to enforce our immigration laws.

So what do we do? We put together the will to enforce our immigration laws. The American people rise up and make the argument that we are going to have the rule of law, that we are going to shut off all illegal traffic at the border. We are going to force all that traffic through the ports of entry.

It's been a little while since we have talked about the necessity of building a wall and a fence on the southern border. Someone said to me we can't build 2,000 miles of fence. Yes, we could. We could build 2,000 miles of triple fencing. We could put sensors on it. We could put lights on it. We could build roads in between. We could patrol it. We could enforce it. We can fix it so nobody gets through all that. Yes, we can. And for the people that will argue if you build a 20-foot fence I will show you a 21-foot ladder, that's got to be the silliest and the weakest and the most specious argument I have heard here on the floor of the United States Congress. I have heard the Secretary of

Homeland Security say build a 50-foot fence and I will show you a 51-foot ladder.

Madam Speaker, what in the world could that mean? All right, if you build a rocket that will fly to the Moon, I will show you a rocket that will fly a mile past the Moon. So what? What does that mean? They are not going to be building a 51-foot ladder. And if they do, we are going to be sitting there with our sensory devices, our roads, our monitoring, and we are going to make sure if they can get over that fence they don't get to the next one. And if they get over that one, we are going to make sure they don't get to the next one.

I have designed a concrete wall. And it is not the only barrier; it is not the only tool. And when those of us that talk about the necessity for extending the fence and the wall on the southern border and building double and tertiary fences and walls, the argument against it becomes this silly argument of, well, that's not going to solve the problem.

None of us believe it's the total solution. None of us believe that building an effective wall and fence is the only thing we would do. It's among the effective things that we could do.

So, Madam Speaker, here are some things that the American people don't know. The President doesn't know. His actuaries don't know. The Speaker of the House doesn't know. HARRY REID, the majority leader in the Senate doesn't know. And the committee Chairs don't know. And I may well be the only one in the United States Congress that knows this. And, Madam Speaker, now the whole world is going to know. Here are the numbers. About 2006 we were spending \$8 billion on our southern border. Now we are spending about \$12 billion on our southern border. All together. These aren't numbers that come out of the administration except one piece at a time. And you have to add them up and calculate it out and calculate it back to the numbers of miles of border that we have. \$12 billion when you add up all of the expenses necessary for ICE that are operating down there near the border in that 20- to 40-mile, maybe 50-mile range of the border.

You have to pay the personnel, their health care package, their benefits package, their retirement funds, their equipment, their vehicles that they drive, guns, uniforms, all those things that they do. And you add to that Custom Border Protection, our CBP people, our Customs personnel, our Border Patrol personnel. And all of the forces that are there lined up that are part of that coordinated effort to defend the border are right in the area of \$12 billion. \$12 billion for 2,000 miles of border. That is \$6 million a mile, Madam Speaker.

Now, think of this. Most of us can think what a mile is. For me, I live on the corner on a gravel road in Iowa. And a lot of those corners you can stand out there in the middle of that

intersection and you can see a mile in each of four directions. It is not the case in mine, but I know how far a mile is. Most of us do.

Now, when I stand on my corner and I look to the west that full mile, a mile west, which is the clearest vision that I have, and I think would the Federal Government pay me—if that were the border, would the Federal Government pay me \$6 million to guard that border for that mile? Could I do that for \$6 million? Would I be willing to take on that contract and control that border for \$6 million for that mile? And that's the average for 2,000 miles. Some of it's barren and desolate. Would I be willing to do that, Madam Speaker, for \$6 million? You betcha. You betcha, to pick up on a phrase. I would do that for \$6 million a mile.

And, furthermore, I would be willing to guarantee nobody would get across that mile. I would guard it, I would protect it, I would hire the personnel necessary. And, in fact, rather than paying a lot of people that were boots on the ground, I would have some, and they would be in mobile vehicles, and we would have sensors, and we would have some lights, and we would have radios, and we would have warning devices and ground-based radar. We would do all that stuff.

□ 2045

But we would also build a fence and a wall as a barrier to slow that traffic down and make it hard enough that they wouldn't come through my mile at all. In fact, I would shut down all the traffic in that mile for \$6 million. And if you award me that contract, I would be willing to let you dock me from that contract. I would guarantee it. I would bond it. I would let you dock me. If they got across my mile, then subtract from my contract every illegal crosser that is there. Then you would put the incentives in place to actually succeed in what we're doing as opposed to just simply doing—it's not catch and release back into America anymore. It's catch and release at the port of entry and turn them back in to Mexico, and then they come back around with a smirk on their face. And I have watched them do that, Madam Speaker.

Another tool that we need to have is the New IDEA Act. New IDEA is legislation that I have introduced in the last three Congresses. The New IDEA stands for the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. That's the acronym, New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. It comes from this part. If you look around, across the agencies of the Federal Government and think about those agencies and how aggressively and how effectively they do their jobs, we have the Department of Homeland Security, which has really pledged that they're not going to deport illegal workers in America.

In fact, they picked up some illegal workers by accident in Boston some months ago back in December or Janu-

ary. They found out that they were illegal. They processed them. These workers were on their way up to Gillette Stadium in Boston. So ICE, after they processed them, hauled them up to work. They gave them chauffeured transportation up to their job to be groundskeepers at Gillette Stadium in Boston, a complete lack of focus on their job.

I mean, you talk about open borders. Jump across the border, come in here and sneak in and get yourself a job and have your documents being invalid, falsification, whatever it might be, misrepresents your status. And if we run across you by accident because our ICE people are out there doing what they do, we will take your fingerprints and your names, and then we'll give you a chauffeured ride on up to work at Gillette Stadium. That is bizarre. It is so far away from an understanding of what it takes to enforce the law.

I take us back to a time in the fifties when my father was a manager of the State police radio stations, and he also was the mayor of a small community. The local town cop came across an illegal who happened to be traveling through the community, and I don't know how they interdicted him, whether it was his license plate light that was out or whatever it was, but he was arrested. He was incarcerated. He was held up in the city jail, and they had to process him. And my father, as mayor, was the justice of the peace as well. There never was any consideration about turning him loose because it was too hard to enforce the law. The only thing that could come from that was the person that was illegally in the United States was going to go back to their home country. And by my recollection, that's what happened.

But the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act recognizes that the Department of Homeland Security hasn't shown a complete will to enforce immigration law. They have got good officers out in the field. They want to do so. They want to deliver on a mission and accomplish a mission statement. They want to accomplish their mission statement, but the lack of will from the White House down through the Secretary of Homeland Security prevents them from being as effective as they can be.

So there's your agency. Department of Homeland Security is not as effective as they can be, enforcing against employers because politically that's more palatable but refusing to enforce against illegal workers because they have decided that those illegal workers can be Democrats. I stand on that statement, Madam Speaker. They've decided those illegal workers can become Democrats, so they want to pander to them.

We've got the Social Security Administration that has a database that should be feeding information to the Department of Homeland Security. Whenever you have duplications of those Social Security numbers, you

can bet that as soon as the second one shows up, if it's outside the neighborhood in the driving range of the first one, that you have one illegal there at least that's working off of that Social Security number—and maybe both of them are illegal.

The Social Security Administration is willing to take the checks that come from the payroll taxes of those millions who are working illegally in America, paying their payroll taxes because it's withheld from their paycheck, but declaring the maximum number of dependents so that they pay Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, but not State and Federal income tax. The Social Security Administration's willing to take those checks from those illegal workers and not explore the duplications on those Social Security numbers because the money's going into the account which is being spent by this Congress but is kept in an accounting process in Parkersburg, West Virginia, in a filing cabinet. And bonds that are worth no more than this piece of paper was, a print on top of it. I happen to have one in my filing cabinet as well. \$3.54 billion in bonds in the Social Security account. It's an IOU from the government to the government. They put them in a filing cabinet in Parkersburg, West Virginia. But illegals pay into that out of proportion because they're not going to file a tax return. And so the dollars that are contributed on that Social Security number go into that filing cabinet along with those bonds.

And we have the Department of Homeland Security who is not willing to enforce the law to the extent that it must be against illegal workers. They may be willing to enforce the law in even an increasing degree over the Bush administration against employers who are hiring illegal workers. The Social Security Administration is cashing the checks of people who have fraudulently misrepresented their identity, and so neither agency has demonstrated the will to enforce the law.

So I brought this legislation called the New IDEA Act which clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible for Federal income tax purposes, and it establishes that there will be a cooperative working effort between Social Security, Homeland Security, and the IRS. The IRS, who has demonstrated they do have a desire to enforce the law, they have been vigorous in enforcing the law, and they would be very useful in stepping into the enforcement of illegal immigration law, and they happen to be in just exactly the right position to do so.

And so under my bill, should it become law—and in fact, my bill has been advocated by the Democrats in the Senate who are proposing immigration legislation, Senator SCHUMER and others. They didn't define the title of the bill, but they defined the bill within their talking points, so I can commend them for recognizing the need.

New IDEA, the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act, clarifies that wages

and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible for income tax purposes, and it directs the IRS to go in under the normal course of their audits, run the Social Security numbers of those employees through, which will show up on the tax forms, run them through the E-Verify program. E-Verify is the Internet-based program that can verify the identity of the employees. It identifies a person who can lawfully work in the United States, and it has a very, very high degree of success and accuracy.

So the IRS would come in in an audit, and they would audit corporation A, and say corporation A has 25 employees. Their Social Security numbers will be listed in their tax forms. They will punch those Social Security numbers in to E-Verify. If it comes back that they can lawfully work in the United States, fine. No problem. If it comes back that they can't verify, then the IRS can give the employer an opportunity to cure those records, to straighten them out and to correct them. But failure to correct those records then can be concluded by the IRS, under the New IDEA Act, the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act, the IRS can then deny the tax deductibility of the wages and benefits paid to the illegals.

When the IRS denies that, then those wages—let's just say that it's \$1 million worth of wages that are paid, are deducted as a business expense like you would deduct, oh, let's say, fuel or any of your overhead that you might have, input from produced products or whatever it might be. That business expense would be denied. And when it's denied, presumably, it goes over into the income column. So \$1 million worth of wages are denied as an expense because it was paid to illegals and denied by the IRS. It would go over here to the other column on the profit side.

And I did this calculation at 34 percent corporate income tax, and it might well be 35 percent today, and I think it's more accurate to say so. But at 34 percent, your \$10 an hour illegal, by the time you add interest and penalty and the 34 percent tax, becomes a \$16 an hour illegal. The IRS steps in then to enforce immigration law by denying the deductibility of wages and benefits paid to illegals, adding the interest and the penalty, and the \$10 an hour illegal becomes a \$16 an hour illegal. Employers will understand that instantly, and they will set about cleaning up their workforce, using E-Verify.

And, by the way, we give that employer safe harbor if he uses E-Verify, using E-Verify to clean up his workforce. And an employer that can't function with the illegal staff that he has may make the decision to incrementally transition over into legal employees over a period of time. Whatever it takes. It's not draconian. It isn't stark. It isn't something that shuts businesses down, but it is something that sets up an incentive for businesses to comply with our immigration law. Should they choose not to do that,

then they can pay the Federal Treasury the difference of \$10 an hour up to \$16 an hour.

We need to fix E-Verify, and we do in my bill. We set up E-Verify so that an employer can use E-Verify to verify the employability status of the applicant upon a bona fide job offer rather than having to hire the individual. Under current E-Verify law, you can't use E-Verify to determine if a job applicant can lawfully work in the United States. You can only do that after you actually hire them. So if you hire an individual, and you run their data through E-Verify and it comes back that they can't confirm that they can lawfully work in the United States, then you have to turn around and fire them.

And I'll take the position that American employers should not be compelled to hire illegals in order to find out that they're illegal. They should be able to say to the individual, Sam, John, Larry, Sally, whoever you are, I'm offering you this job, and the job that I'm offering you is contingent upon your data being approved through E-Verify. I will do that now if you're willing to accept this job. If they say yes, you run the data through. You've got, at a maximum, a 6-second delay to get this verification done. If they don't meet the test, you don't put them on the payroll. I think that it's immoral to hire people that are illegal, and I don't want to be compelled to do that because we've got a flaw in our E-Verify law.

So I appreciate the statement that Mr. POLIS from Colorado made that he's for zero illegal immigration. I don't know how you get to that unless you're willing to enforce the law. I think we need to force all traffic—legal and illegal—and all products—human and other products—through the ports of entry on our southern border. I think we need to go ahead and build a fence and a wall. And at the expense of \$6 million a mile, that's the maintenance of our border. What will it cost us to build a fence and how much will it cut in the cost to maintain the enforcement of that? If we can, for a couple million dollars a mile, build some very effective barriers, that means that we can cut down on the cost to the boots on the ground to enforce those sections and focus our boots on the ground that we have in the areas where we have trouble with enforcement. That's a logical thing to do.

Look around the world. Look at the barrier that they have in Israel, for example, where they had suicide bombers coming through over and over and over again. They built a barrier there, and it's set up to protect the Israelis from the people that would come and do them harm. Is it immoral for them to protect themselves from that kind of damage to their lives and to their limbs and to their treasure? I suggest it is not. And those that would argue that a wall on our border is comparable to the Berlin Wall just completely and intentionally and willfully miss the

most important point, and that is that a wall to keep people out is morally and fundamentally different than a wall to keep people in. The Berlin Wall was about keeping people in. You don't hear the same people argue against the Great Wall of China because they know the Great Wall of China was designed to keep people out, not in. We know that the barrier in Israel has worked. We know that our barriers on our southern border where we have them have worked.

We have tertiary fencing down there in San Luis, Arizona, that is, as near as I can determine, that section of fence—however short it is—it's three layers of fencing. As near as I can determine, it has not been defeated by anyone. It's easier to go around the end than it is to go over, around, under, or through. I don't suggest we build 2,000 miles of wall and fencing with sensors and monitoring and patrol roads. Madam Speaker, I suggest that we simply build a fence and build a wall until they quit going around the end. If we do that, it may take 2,000 miles. It may not. We may just be building the 784 miles that are required by the Secure Fence Act. We would need to have a smart immigration policy.

And here we are, down into the depths of this downward spiral of our economy, this economy that's been referred to a good number of times as the "great recession." And we're talking about, what, granting amnesty to people, perhaps moving pieces of legislation through this Congress that would legalize 12 million to 20 million people in an economic environment where we have 15.4 million unemployed Americans that fit the category, that fit the definition, another 5 million to 6 million Americans who no longer fit the definition for unemployment because they quit trying. So we have over 20 million Americans that are looking for work or should be looking for work or have given up, and we have at least 8 million illegals that are working in the United States, taking up jobs that Americans could and should be doing.

□ 2100

The argument that there is work that Americans won't do, we haven't heard much of that argument in the last year or so, since the economy went into the downward spiral. They haven't said that as often. I have always argued that there isn't work that Americans won't do. We do everything. There is no job in America that is not being done by Americans. No matter how many legal or illegal immigrants might be doing that work, there will always be Americans standing there doing that work as well.

When we travel around the world and look at the work that is being done, work that is characterized as work that Americans won't do, I see that work being done by every nationality in every country. There is no work that Americans won't do. When JOHN MCCAIN talked about he would pay \$50

an hour for people to come and pick lettuce, I am not sure that he ever wrote that check; but I was quite concerned that I would lose my construction crew, who might all migrate down to Arizona to pick lettuce for \$50 an hour.

It isn't a matter that there is work that Americans won't do, it is a matter of there has been a flood of under-skilled labor that are mobile. They are more reactive. They can beat Americans to that job because they are not as tied to real estate. They don't have those kinds of possessions. They have a cell phone network, and if they need 25 people to pick the lettuce in Arizona, that network brings a lot of illegals in there to do that. It doesn't mean Americans won't do it. There is no work Americans won't do.

I mentioned JOHN MCCAIN, and it isn't for the purpose of being critical of the positions he has taken in the past, I say my hats off to the people who have served this country. He is an authentic American hero. He has gone through a tremendous amount of torture and pain and suffering, and he has not lost his resolve to defend this country in a fashion that he believes as a United States Senator.

I would just suggest, here are some real facts. I have asked this question, and I come down to a bottom line consensus: What is the toughest, dirtiest, most dangerous job that we ever ask Americans to do? I will suggest that it is not in the United States. It has been and perhaps will not be again in that particular location, but it is rooting terrorists out of places like Fallujah, or places in Afghanistan, where we ask our soldiers and our marines to put their lives on the line to do that, sometimes in 130 degree heat with 70, 80 pounds that they are carrying. They go in and root those terrorists out of Fallujah. They root them out of Afghanistan. They do that, and if you calculate them at 40 hours a week, for about \$8.09 an hour.

If Americans will do that, if they will take on the toughest, the hottest or the coldest, the dirtiest, and the most dangerous jobs in the world for that kind of money, there is no argument to be made that there are jobs that Americans will not do. We work hard and are willing to take a risk. We stand up for freedom and liberty and the rule of law. The people who put on the uniform to put their lives on the line are very much about defending the pillars of American exceptionalism, the principles that made America great, and they are not about defending someone having a path to citizenship being granted through amnesty.

We owe the honor to the people who have defended our liberty and freedom to stand up for the rule of law. The rule of law has been reestablished by the statute in Arizona, the immigration legislation that they have passed and has been signed into law by the governor.

These immigration laws in Arizona are laws that reflect the Federal immi-

gration law. They fit within the umbrella of the Federal immigration law. Yes, there is a standard called Federal preemption, and that means if the Federal Government passes a law, provided it is constitutional that supersedes that of the States, that is Federal preemption. But we don't have any statutes that preempt immigration law in Arizona because they have drafted their immigration legislation to fit within the umbrella of the Federal immigration law.

And they have set up some clear standards, clear standards that there shall not be racial profiling used as the only criterion when it comes to interdicting or stopping an individual.

Now that happens to fit consistently with Federal case law. We have a responsibility and a duty and an obligation and a legal standard that allows our law enforcement officers to use a profile provided their race isn't the only criterion. And reasonable suspicion includes a whole lot of other criteria in addition to race. We don't want to be foolish or stupid about this.

I recall an incident that took place in Urbandale, Iowa, 15 or more years ago. It is a community that at the time was not populated by minorities in any significant percentage. There was a Cadillac being driven down the street in a higher income residential area by an African American. The law enforcement officer saw that and wondered, and maybe it was actually Windsor Heights, come to think of it, but it was one of the suburbs of Des Moines, and the officer saw that and thought, That doesn't quite fit what goes on in this community. It could have been the same police officer in an African American community that would have made the call if it were perhaps a white person in that community.

But it turned out to be the other way around. He ran the plates on the car and the car was registered to a Caucasian female who lived in the neighborhood. So the officer suspected something was out of order, pulled the car over, and found out that the African American driving the car was the husband of the Caucasian lady whom the car was registered to who lived in the neighborhood.

Okay, it wasn't what you would normally see as typical. One could argue it was racial profiling, but I would argue it was police work picking up the things that were inconsistent and trying to pick the populous. In any event, the settlement was \$60,000 paid to the driver of the car, the husband of the lady who owned the car and was a very legitimate resident of the community and as far as I know, was a very well-respected Iowan.

But sometimes you get caught in the anomaly, and you have to give the police officers their due. They are picking out those things that are out of order and don't fit the normal practice in the neighborhood. And I know the difference. I live in a rural neighborhood. When somebody drives down my road,

we generally know who they are and where they are going. If I drive down the road, they know me. It is part of our own built-in security system.

Where I reside out here in D.C., I know who stands on the street and what the flow of traffic is, and you see those things that are outside the normal flow. That's what police officers do. It isn't and should not be targeting people because of their race. But race can be a factor in a legitimate police activity as long as it is not the only factor. That is what the Arizona law says.

I want to presume that those police officers are operating to enforce the rule of law and protect society and to use the tools that they have to protect the people. That's what they are. They provide security all across this country. Having grown in a law enforcement family, I respect the job that they do and the risk that they take and the judgment and the education that is necessary for them if they are going to enforce the law.

In Arizona, the executive order by the governor ensures that they are going to continue to teach and train their officers so that they stay within compliance of Federal law, Arizona law, Arizona Constitution and the United States Constitution. And if there are deviations from that, I am very confident that the people who are driving wedges between us as Americans will find a way to litigate.

I regret and it saddens me, and in fact it infuriates me, Madam Speaker, that we would see the people who are race baiters who are seeking to drive wedges between the American people, trying to capitalize on this and scare the American people and make it out to be something that it is not. What it is, it is a law that sets up and honors the Federal immigration law that uses the Arizona law enforcement people to enforce an immigration law that is now a State law that is the mirror of the Federal law. We need to understand that in the case of *U.S. v. Santana Garcia*, and several others, that there are Federal precedents that local law enforcement implicitly has the authority to enforce immigration law.

Regardless of whether there is a 287(g) agreement, local law enforcement has the authority to enforce immigration law, and there is a Federal law that prohibits sanctuary cities. It has been exploited by many cities in the country, including San Francisco and Houston, a number of cities that want to boycott Arizona, the violation of the Federal law from prohibiting cities from becoming sanctuary cities has been a circumvention, and it says the series of requirements that are in there that prohibit local cities from, let me say, protecting illegals in their communities, and have they found a way to pass memorandums of understanding or city ordinances that direct their police officers to not gather information, because the statute that was written wasn't tight enough and requires that

once they have the information, they have to transfer it on to Federal law enforcement officials, so they just prohibit their local law enforcement officers from gathering information on illegals.

And so they become sanctuary cities and the streets of the city fill up with people who are here illegally. They are taking jobs from Americans. They are among the 8 millions taking jobs from Americans; and as the streets fill up, they are also turning a blind eye to the illegal drugs and the violence and the abuse that comes out of that community in its entirety.

Madam Speaker, I go back to 12 to 20 million illegals living in America, at least 8 million working in America, 15.4 million unemployed, another 5 to 6 million that quit looking for work that fit that category except they are not trying any longer, over 20 million Americans who need a job, 8 million illegals that are occupying jobs that would all go to people who are either Americans or lawfully present in the United States, in an economy that has been declining and shrinking.

And by the way, we have 1.5 million green cards that are issued on an annual basis. If you look at the workforce in America, 10 years ago the workforce in American was 142 million, now it is 153 million.

□ 2115

It has increased about a little over 1 million a year over the last 10 years. And if you would go back and look, the numbers of green cards has accelerated from about three quarters of a million in that period of time—and that actually is a guess, Madam Speaker—on up to about 1.5 million a year now. Almost the sum total of the expansion of our workforce has been attributable to the legal immigration green cards that are a component of this. And so our economy has to grow and create 1.5 million new jobs a year just to accommodate the legal immigration, let alone the illegal immigration. Those are the facts of what we're faced with today.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm going to make this statement, that we have to put a stop to the illegal immigration in America. We've got to direct all traffic through our ports of entry where we can stop the traffic of illegal drugs, contraband, and people coming into the United States. We need to enforce our immigration law. We need to adopt the new ID Act so the IRS can help us enforce immigration law. And then, while all this is going on, we've got to take a look at the legal immigration in America and make a determination as to how many jobs we want this economy to create to accommodate those who are coming in here legally, and we have to have an economy that's going to be robust.

Furthermore, according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, a household that's headed by a high school dropout costs taxpayers in America an average of \$22,449; \$22,449

over 50 years of heading the household, a \$1.5 million cost to the taxpayers to help sustain this household because we have become a welfare state. When my grandmother came here before the turn of the previous century, she didn't come here to a welfare state. She came here to a meritocracy, and they wanted to ensure that the people that came through Ellis Island were physically and mentally fit and could sustain themselves. And even though they were screened in Europe before they got on the ship, 2 percent of them were sent back from Ellis Island because they didn't meet the standard.

And so here we are today, 1.5 million legal immigrants who are granted work permits in the United States consuming all the new jobs in America and expanding the workforce when we have many more Americans that we could tap into to do this work that we haven't tried. That's 15.4 million unemployed, plus 5 to 6 million who no longer meet that category, 20 million altogether. And if I would put them into this category, those Americans of working age are in the area of 80 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce. So if we would just simply hire one out of 10 of those, we could replace all the illegal workers by hiring 10 percent of those who are not in the workforce, but are of working age; and about 20 million of those are looking for work.

So, Madam Speaker, we have an economy we need to heal up. We've got a rule of law we've got to reestablish. We have demonstrations that are likely to come across America that are designed to just pit Americans against Americans, race-based, race baiting for political purposes, when what we're really looking for here is the enforcement of the rule of law and a robust economy that's going to employ American workers.

We are the most generous country in the world when it comes to allowing legal immigration, roughly 1.5 million a year. No other country comes close to matching that. We need to take a look at our economy, the rule of law, the culture in America, enforce the rule of law, stand with Arizona—who has not done anything except define their Arizona immigration law to reflect that of the Federal law. And the President of the United States, who has directed the Justice Department to examine Arizona law, I think is finding out that it's constitutional, it's statutorily consistent, it cannot be and should not be preempted by Federal law, and it should be honored and respected and supported, not investigated, nor litigated. And I encourage and I thank the people in Arizona for having the courage to step up and pass their legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POLIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CALVERT, for 5 minutes, May 4 and 5.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, May 6.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 6.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 6.

Mr. SHIMKUS, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5147. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 3, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7255. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2008 Tariff-Rate Quota Year received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7256. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "2009 Packers and Stockyards Program Annual Report", pursuant to the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7257. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Charles C. Campbell, United States Army, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7258. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the De-

partment's report on National Guard Counterdrug Schools Activities, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7259. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on activities under the Secretary's personnel management demonstration project authorities for the Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7260. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket IN: FEMA-2010-0003] received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7261. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Deposit Insurance Regulations; Temporary Increase In Standard Coverage Amount; Mortgage Servicing Accounts; Revocable Trust Accounts; International Banking; Foreign Banks (RIN: 3064-AD36) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7262. A letter from the Office of Research and Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — School Food Safety Program Based on Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point Principles [FNS-2008-0033] (RIN: 0584-AD65) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7263. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Race to the Top Fund [Docket ID: ED-2010-OESE-0005] (RIN: 1810-AB10) received April 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

7264. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tire Fuel Efficiency Consumer Information Program [Docket No.: NHTSA-2010-0036] (RIN: 2127-AK45) received April 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7265. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor/Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Facilitate Use of Spread Spectrum Communications Technologies [WT Docket No.: 10-62] received April 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7266. A letter from the Acting Associate Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — High-Cost Universal Service Support Jurisdictional Separations Coalition for Equity in Switching Support Petition for Reconsideration [WC Docket No.: 05-337] [CC Docket No.: 80-286] received April 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on U.S. support for Taiwan's participation as an observer at the 63rd World Health Assembly and in the work of the World Health Organization, as mandated in the Participation of the 2004 Taiwan in the World Health Organization Act, Pub. L. 108-235, Sec. 1(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7268. A letter from the Deputy Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, trans-

mitting the Agency's annual report for Fiscal Year 2009, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, section 203; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7269. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7270. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7271. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Amendment 10 [Docket No.: 0907021105-0024-03] (RIN: 0648-AY00) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7272. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 09100091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XU89) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7273. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Resources of the South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 060525140-6221-02] (RIN: 0648-XU16) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7274. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone of Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2010 and 2011 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XS43) received April 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7275. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2010 and 2011 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XS44) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7276. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Inseason Action to Close the Commercial Gulf of Mexico Non-Sandbar Large Coastal Shark Fishery (RIN: 0648-XU90) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7277. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule —

Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Plan Regulations [Docket No.: 080721862-91321-03] (RIN: 0648-AW51) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7278. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act — 2009 Implementation [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0891] (RIN: 1625-AB40) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7279. A letter from the Director, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "National Drug Threat Assessment (NPDTA) 2010"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7280. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator/Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Information on Foreign Chain of Distribution for Ephedrine, Pseudoephedrine, and Phenylpropanolamine [Docket No.: DEA-295F] (RIN: 1117-AB07) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7281. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator/Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes to and Consolidation of DEA Mailing Addresses [Docket No.: DEA-312F] (RIN: 1117-AB19) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7282. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2010 Rates for Pilotage on the Great Lakes [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0883] (RIN: 1625-AB39) received April 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5175. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit foreign influence in Federal elections, to prohibit government contractors from making expenditures with respect to such elections, and to establish additional disclosure requirements with respect to spending in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 5176. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to prohibit States and Territories from classifying self-employed individuals as employees under state collective bargaining laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 5177. A bill to delay the implementation of certain final rules of the Environmental Protection Agency in States until accreditation classes are held in the States for a period of at least 1 year; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr.

GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. STARK, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. DeLAURO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DeGETTE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINCHAY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREEN of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WU, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HARE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MATHE-SON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SIRE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KILROY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 5178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to reduce tobacco smuggling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAHLKEMPER:

H.R. 5179. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that family coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program remains available with respect to an otherwise eligible child of a Federal employee or annuitant until that child attains 26 years of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 5180. A bill to establish an Ombudsman Office within the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ARCURI (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the preservation of the small arms production industrial base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5182. A bill to help certain communities adversely affected by FEMA's flood

mapping modernization program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRIGHT:

H.R. 5183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the first-time homebuyer tax credit through December 31, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. OLIVER):

H.R. 5184. A bill to amend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to include bullying and harassment prevention programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DeFAZIO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 5185. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the TRICARE program and the CHAMPVA program; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5186. A bill to extend the chemical facility security program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 5187. A bill to require the Secretary to establish a commission that is designed to construct a comprehensive national strategy on how to increase the affordability, accessibility, and effectiveness of long-term care and community services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINCHAY:

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the first-time homebuyer tax credit through December 31, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHAY:

H.R. 5189. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the issuer of a tax-exempt State or local obligation obtain a certification that the interest rate with respect to such obligation is reasonable without materially increasing the risks associated with the obligation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5190. A bill to reauthorize the Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act of 2004, to provide assistance to Best Buddies to support the expansion and development of mentoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor,

and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 5191. A bill to increase the United States financial and programmatic contributions to promote economic opportunities for women in developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 5192. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to designate national forests or portions of national forests in western States as locations for demonstration projects to prevent or mitigate the effect of pine beetle infestations and conduct forest restoration activities, to authorize the emergency removal of dead and dying trees to address public safety risks in western States, to make permanent the stewardship contracting authorities available to the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 5193. A bill to establish an employment-based immigrant visa for alien entrepreneurs who have received significant capital from investors to establish a business in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKEON:

H.R. 5194. A bill to designate Mt. Andrea Lawrence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 5195. A bill to establish a director of anti-trafficking policies in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5196. A bill to support State and tribal government efforts to promote research and education related to maple syrup production, natural resource sustainability in the maple syrup industry, market promotion of maple products, and greater access to lands containing maple trees for maple sugaring activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 43rd anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself, Mr. BOYD, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution recognizing the many contributions made by general aviation pilots and operators to the Haiti earthquake relief efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H. Res. 1307. A resolution honoring the National Science Foundation for 60 years of service to the Nation; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. TANNER):

H. Res. 1308. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the International Year of Biodiversity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, and Mr. WELCH):

H. Res. 1309. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there is need for further study of the Functional Gastrointestinal Disorder (FGID) Irritable Bowel Syndrome (IBS); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself, Mr. INGALLS, Mr. WU, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Ms. GIFFORDS):

H. Res. 1310. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the laser; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. FARR):

H. Res. 1311. A resolution expressing support for the charitable collection and good samaritan distribution to uninsured, low-income Americans of Food and Drug Administration-approved, medically-appropriate, non-expired, non-narcotic prescription medications by non-profit organizations licensed to dispense such medications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MICA, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DENT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H. Res. 1312. A resolution recognizing the roles and contributions of America's teachers to building and enhancing our Nation's civic, cultural, and economic well-being; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. Res. 1313. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as "Child Advo-

cacy Center Month" and commending the National Child Advocacy Center in Huntsville, Alabama, on their 25th anniversary in 2010; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 1314. A resolution urging the Government of Canada to end the commercial seal hunt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. HARE):

H. Res. 1315. A resolution urging the Secretary of State to designate the Caucasus Emirate as a foreign terrorist organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. CHU, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SIRE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WU, Mr. FARR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. CAO, Mr. KAGEN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia):

H. Res. 1316. A resolution celebrating Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. PAUL):

H. Res. 1317. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the value-added tax in addition to existing Federal taxes is a massive tax increase that will result in hardships for United States families and job-creating small business and will stunt economic recovery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAFFEI:

H. Res. 1318. A resolution congratulating Jim Boehm, head coach of the Syracuse University Orange men's basketball team and a native of Lyons, New York, for receiving many coaching awards for the impressive achievements of the Syracuse University Orange 2009-2010 men's basketball team; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIRE (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SMITH

of New Jersey, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. LANCE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

H. Res. 1319. A resolution congratulating Coach Bob Hurley, Sr. of St. Anthony High School in Jersey City, New Jersey, on his induction into the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame and celebrating his achievements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

269. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 681 urging the Congress and the President of the United States to pass and sign legislation that would provide a temporary extension of the ARRA's Enhanced FMAP; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 24: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 39: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 40: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 108: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 197: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 208: Mr. FORBES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 211: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.
H.R. 476: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 510: Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 764: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 848: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 868: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 873: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 995: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 997: Mr. WALDEN and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1021: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. KAGEN, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1036: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 1067: Mr. MICA and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1074: Mr. CAMP and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 1126: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1210: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1322: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1346: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1505: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1547: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1625: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1655: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1691: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1751: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1792: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1826: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1829: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1961: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. WU.
H.R. 2054: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2149: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2277: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 2296: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.
H.R. 2328: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2336: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 2378: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 2406: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 2480: Mr. KRATOVL.
H.R. 2542: Mr. KRATOVL.
H.R. 2579: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 2625: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2737: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.
H.R. 2766: Mr. MCMAHON and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2849: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 3035: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3101: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3185: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3202: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 3212: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3240: Mr. MINNICK.
H.R. 3286: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3333: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3408: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FARR, Mr. WU, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 3427: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3448: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 3486: Mr. KRATOVL.
H.R. 3487: Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 3502: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3519: Mr. WELCH, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3666: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3668: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3699: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 3734: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3781: Mr. NYE and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3790: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. WU, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 3839: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 3905: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 3924: Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 3936: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 4014: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4070: Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 4072: Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 4114: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4116: Ms. KILROY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 4128: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4279: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4296: Mr. SPACE.
H.R. 4325: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4402: Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4427: Mr. FORBES, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BOREN.
H.R. 4469: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 4473: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4477: Mr. WEINER and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.
H.R. 4509: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WU, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 4525: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 4544: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 4554: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4594: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4601: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4603: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 4638: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4645: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 4647: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 4662: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 4671: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 4676: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4678: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 4684: Mr. TANNER.
H.R. 4687: Mr. BACA, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 4689: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GRAVES.
H.R. 4690: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4746: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4751: Mr. WELCH and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 4755: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 4780: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4785: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 4788: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WU, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4835: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. SHULER.
H.R. 4850: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 4859: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 4866: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 4876: Mr. STUPAK and Ms. BEAN.
H.R. 4896: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H.R. 4923: Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4925: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4940: Mr. WHITFIELD and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 4941: Mr. TEAGUE and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 4945: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 4947: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 4951: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.
H.R. 4952: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 4958: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4959: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4961: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WATT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4972: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4993: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 5012: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 5015: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. STARK, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5032: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5034: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 5035: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5044: Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 5049: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 5054: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 5065: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 5078: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5084: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5092: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 5095: Mr. ROONEY.
H.R. 5118: Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 5126: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 5128: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5131: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 5141: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. OLSON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TIAHRT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 5144: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 5159: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 5162: Mr. SPACE and Mr. BOREN.

H.R. 5173: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. JONES.

H.J. Res. 61: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. COLE.

H.J. Res. 77: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. FORBES.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. WELCH.

H. Con. Res. 110: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Con. Res. 137: Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Con. Res. 245: Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. NYE, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. COSTA.

H. Con. Res. 262: Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 268: Mr. COHEN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. HALL of New York, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 173: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TERRY, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. SPACE.

H. Res. 764: Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 873: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 913: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 936: Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 1056: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 1077: Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 1149: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. PETRI.

H. Res. 1162: Mr. SIREN, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 1207: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATTA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Res. 1224: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Res. 1226: Mr. SIREN, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 1231: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WU, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 1234: Mr. ARCURI.

H. Res. 1245: Mr. AKIN, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Ms. JENKINS.

H. Res. 1247: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. CAO, Mr. FARR, and Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 1258: Mr. REYES, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 1277: Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 1279: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Res. 1285: Mr. WEINER and Mr. McMAHON.

H. Res. 1291: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 1294: Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 1295: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. SCALISE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs.

SCHMIDT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. McKEON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HELLER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. POSEY, Mr. McHENRY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COSTA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H. Res. 1297: Mr. PETERS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Res. 1299: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. MCCAUL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HASTINGS of Washington, or a designee, to H.R. 2499 the Puerto Rico Democracy Act of 2009, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

122. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City of Lauderhill, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 10R-02-46 congratulating the President on receiving the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petition:

Petition 10 by Mr. JONES on H.R. 775: Virginia Foxx, Todd Russell Platts, Jerry Moran, Cathy McMorris Rodgers.